FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE STATES PARTIES TO
AMENDED PROTOCOL II ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF
MINES, BOOBY-TRAPS AND OTHER DEVICES AS AMENDED ON 3 MAY 1996
ANNEXED TO THE CONVENTION ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON
THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED
TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS

Geneva, 15 - 17 December 1999

FINAL DOCUMENT

Part II

Geneva, 2000

Part II

DOCUMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE

Note

The present document - Part II of the Final Document, entitled Documents of the Conference - includes the summary records of the First Annual Conference and the lists of participants in the Preparatory Meeting for the First Annual Conference (25-26 May 1999) and in the First Annual Conference (15-17 December 1999).

The National Annual Reports submitted by 31 States Parties to Amended Protocol II are contained in documents CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/NAR.1-31. All other documents considered by the First Annual Conference appear in their final, approved version as annexes to the Final Report of the First Annual Conference previously issued as Part I of the Final Document.¹

¹CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/2 (Part I)
II. Lists of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Preparatory Meeting,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Geneva, 25 - 26 May 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW/AP.II/PM/CONF.1/INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. First Annual Conference,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Geneva, 15 - 17 December 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/INF.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1ST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Wednesday, 15 December 1999, at 10 a.m.

Temporary President: Mr. BENSMAIL (Provisional Secretary-General of the Conference)

President: Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden)

CONTENTS

OPENING OF THE FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE STATES PARTIES TO THE AMENDED PROTOCOL II TO THE CONVENTION ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS BY THE PROVISIONAL SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE

SUBMISSION OF THE PROCEDURAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

GE.99-67332 (E)
CONTENTS (continued)

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE

ELECTION OF OTHER OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ADOPTION OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE

ORGANIZATION OF WORK INCLUDING THAT OF ANY SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONFERENCE

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS
The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

OPENING OF THE FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE STATES PARTIES TO THE AMENDED PROTOCOL II TO THE CONVENTION ON PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS WHICH MAY BE DEEMED TO BE EXCESSIVELY INJURIOUS OR TO HAVE INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS BY THE PROVISIONAL SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE (item 1 of the provisional agenda)

1. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT declared open the First Annual Conference of the States Parties to the Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The principal aim of the Conference, which was the first to be held since the entry into force in December 1998 of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Amended Protocol II), was to begin the annual process of examining the operation and status of the Protocol. He was convinced that the process would contribute to the effective implementation of that important international instrument.

SUBMISSION OF THE PROCEDURAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING (item 2 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

2. Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden), speaking as Chairman of the Preparatory Meeting of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II, introduced the Meeting’s procedural report (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1), of which annexes II (Provisional agenda of the First Annual Conference), III (Draft rules of procedure for annual conferences) and IV (Estimated costs of the Preparatory Meeting and First Annual Conference) were relevant to the work of the Conference. He recalled that the purpose of the Preparatory Meeting had been to prepare the ground for the holding of the First Annual Conference of States Parties and to submit recommendations to be acted upon by the Conference.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT (item 3 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

3. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT drew attention to rule 3 of the draft rules of procedure contained in annex III of document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1, which provided that the Conference should elect a President from among the States parties participating in the Conference. At its final meeting on 26 May 1999, the Preparatory Meeting had unanimously agreed to recommend the election of Ambassador Johan Molander of Sweden as President of the First Annual Conference, as indicated in paragraph 19 of document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1. He took it that the Conference wished to approve that recommendation.

4. Mr. Molander (Sweden) was elected President of the Conference by acclamation.

5. Mr. Molander (Sweden) took the Chair.

6. The PRESIDENT said that, when it had been agreed in May 1996 to amend the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, a number
of breakthroughs had been made in terms of both the contents of the Protocol and international law. If the rules of Amended Protocol II were generally applied, the risks of future landmine catastrophes would dramatically decrease. Progress had been achieved in enlarging the scope of the Protocol for it to apply to internal conflicts, outlawing non-detectable anti-personnel landmines, instituting the first export prohibition on certain types of landmines, introducing prohibitions aimed at protecting humanitarian missions and establishing an annual review mechanism.

7. The progress made, however, had been overshadowed in part by the inability to create a global consensus on the concept of a total prohibition of anti-personnel landmines. Negotiations had been continued in another forum and had led to the adoption by a number of States of the Ottawa Convention. Although everyone agreed that the eventual goal was to abolish all anti-personnel landmines, some States had already applied the prohibition, while others, for reasons of their own, had only been able to accept restrictions and prohibitions of a partial nature.

8. Unfortunately, the two international instruments had been seen by many as antithetical, whereas they in fact complemented each other. The Ottawa Convention was a kind of lex specialis in the field of anti-personnel landmines relating to the broader law of mines, booby traps and other devices dealt with in Amended Protocol II. It was therefore important to overcome the misconception that it was sufficient to be a party to one of the instruments or to the lex specialis alone. The Conference should appeal to all States to accede to Amended Protocol II, which would also have the effect of reconfirming the importance of the Convention as a whole.

9. The CCW process and in particular the annual conferences on Amended Protocol II constituted for the time being the only global forum in which States which had refrained from using anti-personnel landmines and those which still deemed it necessary to use them could meet to discuss landmine issues at large in a dispassionate way. The experts' work would help achieve the objective of setting the stage, for discussion of the major humanitarian problem which mines of all kinds continued to represent.

10. Forty-four States had notified the Depositary of their consent to be bound by Amended Protocol II. Forty of them were participants in the Conference, which also included 32 States not parties to the Protocol.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (item 4 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

11. The President drew attention to the provisional agenda contained in Annex II to document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1 and indicated that the English version of agenda item 13 should read: "Consideration of matters arising from reports by High Contracting Parties according to paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the Protocol". As the Preparatory Meeting had agreed in paragraph 13 of its procedural report to recommend the provisional agenda to the First Annual Conference, he would take it that the Conference approved that recommendation.

12. The agenda was adopted.
ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE (agenda item 5) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

13. The PRESIDENT noted that the Preparatory Meeting had agreed in paragraph 14 of its procedural report (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1) to recommend to the First Annual Conference the draft rules of procedure contained in annex III to the report. In accordance with the decision taken at the Preparatory Meeting, he made the following statement:

"With regard to rule 29 of the draft rules of procedure, it is affirmed that in the deliberations and negotiations relating to the Convention and its annexed Protocols, High Contracting Parties have proceeded on the basis of consensus and no decisions have been taken by vote."

14. He also drew attention to a slight error in draft rule 3: the cross-reference in the second sentence should be to rule 7 rather than rule 9.

15. The PRESIDENT said he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the draft rules of procedure, in the light of the statement he had just read out and taking note of the correction to rule 3.

16. It was so decided.

17. The draft rules of procedure, as amended, were adopted.

18. The PRESIDENT noted that non-governmental organizations were participating in the Conference subject to rule 41 of the rules of procedure. The International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, an intergovernmental organization which had not formally taken part in the work relating to the Conference, would participate in the Conference subject to rule 39 of the rules of procedure.

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 6) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

19. The PRESIDENT, noting that the Preparatory Meeting had agreed in paragraph 20 of the procedural report to recommend to the First Annual Conference the confirmation of Mr. Bensmail as Secretary-General of the Conference, said he took it that the Conference approved the recommendation.

20. The nomination of Mr. Bensmail as Secretary-General of the Conference was confirmed.

ELECTION OF OTHER OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 7) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

21. The PRESIDENT, referring to rule 3 of the rules of procedure, which provided for the election of two Vice-Presidents, noted that the Preparatory Meeting had elected Mr. Draganov of Bulgaria and Mr. Li Changhe of China as Vice-Chairmen and in paragraph 19 of its procedural report recommended that they should assist the Chairman in handling technical and other matters in the period before the First Annual Conference was convened. As the consultations he had
conducted indicated that there was agreement to elect the representatives of Bulgaria and China as Vice-Presidents of the Conference, and as Ambassador Li Changhe of China had been replaced by Mr. Hu Xiaodi, he took it that the Conference decided to elect Mr. Draganov of Bulgaria and Mr. Hu Xiaodi of China as Vice-Presidents.

22. Mr. Draganov (Bulgaria) and Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) were elected Vice-Presidents of the Conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS (agenda item 8)

23. Mr. BENSMAIL (Secretary-General of the Conference) read out the following message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

"It gives me great pleasure to greet the participants in this Conference and to celebrate the first anniversary of the Amended Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices.

This instrument represents a significant step forward in the development of both international disarmament law and humanitarian law as it applies to the use of anti-personnel landmines in armed conflict. It also represents a concrete demonstration of the evolving nature of the CCW Convention and its capacity to respond to widespread and growing concerns about the victimization of civilians in armed conflict and the unnecessary suffering of combatants. The Amendments to Protocol II had the important effect of broadening its scope so that it now covers internal armed conflicts, as well as international conflicts. This, I believe, was a timely and important step forward.

In addition, restrictions on the use of all types of mines were significantly strengthened and the use of non-detectable anti-personnel mines was prohibited, with a deferral period to allow time for technical compliance. Furthermore, the use of non-self-destructing and non-self-deactivating mines outside fenced, monitored and marked areas was prohibited and the transfer of non-detectable anti-personnel landmines was banned. Finally, broader obligations to protect peacekeeping and other missions of the United Nations and its agencies were accepted by Parties to the Protocol.

Annual conferences offer a good opportunity to review the operation and status of the Protocol, and ensure that concerns about the weapons it covers are addressed. In addition, this Conference allows you to prepare for the Review Conference of the Convention and its Protocols in 2001, and to consider the development of technologies to protect civilians against the indiscriminate effects of mines. Another important role of this Conference is to consider matters arising from the reports which Parties are required to provide annually on, among other things, national steps taken to meet the technical requirements of the Protocol, measures taken on technical cooperation and assistance, and information on mine clearance and rehabilitation programmes.

Since the Preparatory Meeting for this Conference was held last May, Amended Protocol II has entered into force for 10 more States, bringing the total number of
States parties to 37. In addition, seven States have notified the Depositary of their consent to be bound by the Amended Protocol. I am encouraged that recently the fifty-fourth session of the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 54/58, which, among other things, welcomed the entry into force of the Protocol and called for its universal adherence. I would therefore like to appeal to all States that have not yet done so to take all measures to become parties to the Protocol as soon as possible.

The global elimination of the threat posed by anti-personnel landmines is one of the paramount challenges facing the international community today. The entry into force of Amended Protocol II, along with the entry into force of the Ottawa Convention in March 1999, show that the world is determined to combat the scourge of landmines. A successful outcome to this conference will further contribute to this shared objective. I wish you every success in your endeavours.”

ADOPTION OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 9) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1)

24. The PRESIDENT, noting that in paragraph 15 of its procedural report (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1), the Preparatory Meeting approved the estimated costs for the First Annual Conference as contained in annex IV of the report, said he took it that the Conference decided to adopt those arrangements.

25. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK INCLUDING THAT OF ANY SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 10)

26. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in order to utilize fully the limited time available, and after consultations with members of the Bureau and the regional group coordinators, the Conference should hold plenary meetings for a general exchange of views as provided for under item 11 of the agenda and to consider and adopt its report. He also suggested that, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, the Conference should establish an open-ended experts group to consider items 13 and 15 of the agenda and report to the plenary. For item 13, on consideration of matters arising from reports submitted by High Contracting Parties according to paragraph 4 of article 13 of the Protocol, he suggested that the experts should review national reports both from a substantive viewpoint, to identify the issues and trends they revealed, and from a practical perspective, to recommend an effective reporting format for future reports. Item 15, on the development of technologies to protect civilians against indiscriminate effects of mines, was obviously of a technical nature and would benefit from the expertise of military and defence representatives.

27. His consultations showed that Colonel Dahinden of the Swiss delegation would be willing to undertake the task of chairing an experts group. The group would be responsible for reviewing the 28 reports submitted by the States parties to date, drawing conclusions from the trends they revealed and recommending a format for future reports. He suggested that the Conference should appoint Colonel Dahinden as friend of the Chair to direct the group’s work.
That would leave items 11, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 18 to be dealt with in plenary. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Conference wished to proceed in that way.

28. It was so decided.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (agenda item 11)

29. Mr. HAYASHI (Japan) said that the considerable improvements to the original text of Amended Protocol II, which extended its scope and established more strictly-regulated mine use and transfer restrictions, represented an important step towards solving landmine problems.

30. Amended Protocol II, which Japan had been the fifth State to ratify, continued to be of great significance even after the completion of the Ottawa Convention. First, Amended Protocol II regulated not only landmines but all types of mines, booby traps and other devices. Second, the Protocol was accepted by those countries which were not in a position to accede to the Ottawa Convention for various reasons of their own, including their national defence needs. Every effort must be made to increase the number of States parties. Third, although Amended Protocol II did not achieve a total ban on landmines, it introduced a significant partial ban by allowing only for specific types of landmines and modes of operation, which would not fail to contribute to reducing casualties among civilians in countries which continued to use anti-personnel landmines.

31. For Amended Protocol II to be a success, full and sincere implementation of the obligations arising from it was vital; the international community must therefore concentrate its efforts on tackling landmine problems, especially in preparation for a meeting of governmental experts in 2000 and the 2001 Review Conference in accordance with article 8 of the CCW.

32. After the entry into force of the Ottawa Convention, various countries which had been unable to accede to it had suggested that a ban on the transfer of anti-personnel landmines should be negotiated. Intensive discussions had taken place in the Conference on Disarmament during the past two years, although they had not yet reached a final conclusion. Other countries had argued that a ban on the transfer of anti-personnel landmines should be negotiated in the CCW framework, as the Protocol had left significant areas untouched. His delegation was aware of the technical problems involved, such as the differences in definition between the Ottawa Convention and Amended Protocol II. It was not at present in a position to reach a definite conclusion as to which framework was the most suitable for negotiations, but such a problem could clearly not be allowed to persist indefinitely. For that reason, Japan urged the States concerned to begin consultations to find an adequate framework and begin negotiations as early as possible. A legally-binding framework for a ban on the transfer of anti-personnel landmines might eventually be accepted by those countries outside the Ottawa Convention.

33. Japan was already helping to resolve some of the problems addressed by both Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention. It had acceded to the Convention on 30 September 1998, on which occasion the Minister for Foreign Affairs had proposed a “zero victims” programme and announced Japan’s contribution of about $100 million over the following five years for mine clearance and assistance to victims. In implementing that pledge, Japan had made bilateral contributions for mine clearance in Cambodia and contributions to
various international and regional agencies and NGOs for activities related to mine awareness, mine clearance and assistance to victims. After the successful First Meeting of States Parties in Maputo, Japan had continued to participate actively in the intersessional work and had been given a special role as co-rapporteur of the Victim Assistance Standing Committee of Experts.

34. Mr. LUCK (Australia) said that Amended Protocol II played a crucial role in strengthening the global regime relating to landmines and in addressing the humanitarian and socio-economic effects of those weapons. The amendments to the Protocol ensured responsible use of anti-personnel mines and increased the protection of civilians, especially women and children, who had borne the brunt of the past irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, and of peacekeeping forces and humanitarian missions caught up in conflict situations.

35. Another important element of Amended Protocol II was the fact that it restricted and regulated the use of all mines, including anti-handling devices, whereas the Ottawa Convention covered anti-personnel mines only. The broader scope of Amended Protocol II enhanced its intrinsic value. To spread that value to a broader cross-section of the international community, Australia’s top priority for Amended Protocol II was to increase the current level of adherence. It therefore encouraged States not parties to Amended Protocol II, including those which had acceded to the original Protocol II, to accede to Amended Protocol II as soon as possible.

36. The Australian Government was in principle prepared to support proposals to strengthen the provisions of Amended Protocol II by, for example, increasing the reliability of its self-destruction and self-deactivation specifications, extending them to anti-vehicle mines and providing the Protocol with an effective compliance mechanism. Given the situation as it stood, however, strengthening the provisions might have the effect of discouraging potential adherents. The Australian Government therefore suggested that any effort to strengthen the provisions of Amended Protocol II should be postponed until the 2001 CCW Review Conference, by which time the level of adherence would have increased. States parties would also need to weigh up the potential gains of strengthening the Protocol against the effort and extra costs which might be required to put strengthened provisions in place.

37. In particular, there had been recent suggestions that Amended Protocol II should be further amended to include a ban on the transfer of anti-personnel landmines. The negotiation of such a ban in the Conference on Disarmament had long been an Australian priority, as the Conference on Disarmament offered several advantages over the CCW option: a number of key landmine users were members of the Conference on Disarmament but not parties to Amended Protocol II and it would be technically simpler to develop a comprehensive, verifiable ban from the ground up in the Conference on Disarmament rather than make further amendments to Amended Protocol II.

38. The issue of landmines had become prominent on the international stage in recent years. Great strides had been made in putting in place a thorough and effective framework to address the immense task of mine clearance, mine awareness and victim assistance. To enhance the effectiveness of those programmes, the Australian Government had contributed funding to
various humanitarian agencies, NGOs and the United Nations. The principal aim of the funding was to help mine-affected countries to build their own capacity to sustain long-term, national demining programmes.

39. The Australian Government had also funded the deployment of Australian Defence Force personnel for demining activities in a number of countries and the supply of innovative Australian technology, such as the Minelab demining unit, which was the equipment of choice for United Nations demining operations in Cambodia and elsewhere.

40. Further innovation and technological development would be necessary to confront the global landmine crisis in an efficient and cost-effective way. Australia was pleased that that subject was being considered in an increasing number of international forums, with the involvement of NGOs and academic and industry representatives. A number of Australian business entities and academic institutions were actively engaged in research to find more effective ways of detecting landmines, removing them and protecting civilians from their effects. As a demonstration of its commitment to a landmine-free world, Australia had recently destroyed its stockpile of anti-personnel mines and devised a new and cost-effective system of destruction which it hoped other countries would be able to use in destroying their own stockpiles.

41. Mr. SHA Zukang (China) said that, with the introduction of further restrictions on the use and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, Amended Protocol II served effectively to prevent the indiscriminate use of landmines and lessen their threat to civilians and to production activities in peaceful times.

42. There were at present two international legal instruments concerning landmines, Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention, both of which had made contributions to reducing civilian casualties in recent years. The two instruments were in fact complementary; their difference lay in the fact that Amended Protocol II gave full consideration to both the humanitarian concerns and the legitimate security requirements of sovereign States and struck a balance between the two, whereas the Ottawa Convention, based solely on humanitarian concerns, opted for a total ban on landmines as its basic purpose. While fully respecting the sovereign choice made by the States parties to the Ottawa Convention, China believed that, in addressing the problem of anti-personnel landmines, all countries should proceed from their respective situation and work to seek a common ground while putting aside their differences.

43. China noted with regret that a major problem faced by Amended Protocol II was its lack of universality, as some countries which needed anti-personnel landmines for self-defence had not yet acceded to it, while others had signed the Protocol but were still in the process of ratification. It was therefore imperative to promote the universality of Amended Protocol II, and it had to be acknowledged that further revisions would cause confusion and difficulties for States in the process of ratification and therefore detract from that purpose. Further revisions would also make implementation more difficult. It would be unwise, moreover, to expand the scope of Amended Protocol II and set out additional technical standards before universality and effective implementation had been achieved.
44. The Chinese Government attached great importance to addressing humanitarian concerns about the civilian casualties caused by anti-personnel landmines and supported strict compliance with the restrictions placed on the use of anti-personnel landmines in Amended Protocol II. In addressing humanitarian concerns, however, consideration should also be given to the legitimate self-defence requirements of sovereign countries. Given the wide diversity of countries' conditions, it was natural for their levels of weaponry and security environments to differ greatly. That fact should not be overlooked. From that perspective, his delegation held that Amended Protocol II provided the most appropriate way of addressing the landmine issue.

45. The civilian casualties caused by landmines could be attributed to the shortcomings of old models of landmines, their indiscriminate use and inefficiency in post-war demining. To address that problem, a two-pronged approach - mine restriction and mine clearance - was necessary. His Government had taken concrete measures on both fronts.

46. With regard to mine restriction, Amended Protocol II had introduced necessary regulations for rectifying the shortcomings of the old models of landmines if implemented fully and in earnest. China had deposited its instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in November 1998 and, since then, the Government and armed forces of China had strictly complied with the Protocol. Information about the Protocol had been disseminated to civilians and the armed forces through the media and other channels. China was transforming and eliminating anti-personnel landmines which were not in conformity with the provisions of Amended Protocol II. It had also undertaken research on possible alternatives to anti-personnel landmines and had destroyed over 1.7 million old models.

47. In order to eliminate the threat of landmines to civilians, the Chinese Government had stepped up its mine clearance efforts both domestically and internationally. From 1992 to 1999, the Chinese Government had launched two large-scale mine clearance operations in Chinese territory along the Chinese-Vietnamese border.

48. In addition, according to the relevant provisions of the Protocol, the Chinese Government had made considerable efforts to provide international mine clearance assistance. It had also made donations to the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance and provided mine clearance equipment to mine-affected countries. In cooperation with the United Nations, China had sponsored an international mine clearance training workshop for trainees from mine-affected countries, such as Cambodia, Namibia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and intended to sponsor more workshops of that kind in future.

49. In October 1999 the Chinese Government had submitted its annual report outlining China's implementation of Amended Protocol II.

50. Mr. SIESTA (Finland), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Union and Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, said that international efforts to deal with problems related to landmines had produced major results in the past few years, with the adoption of Amended Protocol II and the entry into force of the Ottawa Convention, which had been a significant success for both disarmament and humanitarian policy.
51. While the total elimination of anti-personnel mines remained a key objective, as provided for in the Ottawa Convention, wide adherence to Amended Protocol II was also important. The European Union wished to stress the complementary nature of the two instruments, as the Protocol covered not only landmines but booby traps and other devices. It was therefore important for the Annual Conference to emphasize that all countries should accede to Amended Protocol II.

52. The European Union was also committed to solving problems caused by anti-personnel landmines, pending their total elimination. Its efforts in that area were based on the Joint Action established just before the opening for signature of the Ottawa Convention in November 1997. The Joint Action included a commitment to promote universal accession to Amended Protocol II and an active contribution by European Union member States to the Annual Conferences of High Contracting Parties provided for in article 13 of the Protocol.

53. In fulfilling the mandate clearly defined in article 13 of the Protocol, the States parties should prepare for the 2001 Review Conference and address existing concerns by identifying problems and possible shortcomings encountered by them in implementing the at times complex obligations of Amended Protocol II. Proposing solutions to some of those problems might provide an incentive for broader adherence.

54. The Conference should also contribute to international efforts to protect civilians against the effects of landmines.

55. The member States of the European Union had based their national reports on the proposed draft format circulated by Austria, which was designed to facilitate the completion of reporting obligations under article 13, paragraph 4, and article 11, paragraph 2, of the Protocol. The format allowed for better comparison of national reports. The European Union welcomed the initiative taken by Ambassador Molander, the President of the First Annual Conference, to organize expert discussions on national reports during the Conference, and hoped that the discussions would provide an opportunity to address any anomalies in the reports and develop the reporting format further.

56. The European Union would also like to underline the importance of article 14 of Amended Protocol II, which required the High Contracting Parties to undertake appropriate measures to ensure compliance with the Protocol. The First Annual Conference of the Parties provided an opportunity to review the implementation of that article. Contributions of High Contracting Parties with a view to the forthcoming Review Conference would also be welcome. The European Union was prepared to look at ideas and possibilities for developing the Protocol in a constructive spirit.

57. Concerning technologies to protect civilians against the indiscriminate effects of mines, cooperation should be developed in close coordination with the efforts undertaken as part of the follow-up to the Ottawa Convention.

58. Mr. BALBONI ACQUA (Italy) said that Italy fully supported the statement of the representative of Finland on behalf of the European Union and fully shared the Union’s commitment to work towards the full implementation of the provisions of Amended Protocol II.
He wished, nonetheless, to supply further details to demonstrate Italy's full determination to combat devices which, for their devastating effects over the years, had been termed weapons of mass destruction with delayed effects.

59. At the multilateral level, Italy had fulfilled the obligations arising under the Protocol. In April 1999 it had ratified the most recent international instrument concerning such devices, the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. In fact Italy had anticipated those obligations by adopting, in 1997, an even more ambitious domestic law which totally banned both anti-personnel landmines and anti-tank landmines with anti-handling devices. In enacting that law the Italian Parliament had sought to embrace the fundamental principles of humanitarian law which imposed the obligation of distinguishing between civilians and combatants and limiting the right of belligerents to choose their methods of warfare. Its objective was to criminalize the possession of a weapon which might have indiscriminate effects even if operated with a sense of responsibility and according to a consolidated military doctrine.

60. The Government, Parliament and society in Italy were aware of the fundamental importance of banning the use and possession of anti-personnel landmines and were convinced that the main objective to be pursued was universal adhesion to existing international rules, in particular Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention, to be followed by the further development of humanitarian law through a stricter ban on such weapons, taking the Italian law as a model.

61. Mr. HEDBERG (Sweden), associating himself with the views expressed by the representative of Finland on behalf of the member countries of the European Union, said that he would highlight some important points concerning the work of the Conference. As attested by the wide support for the CCW resolution tabled at the latest session of the General Assembly and adopted without a vote, there was agreement within the international community that the world must be rid of anti-personnel landmines. However, there were as yet only 44 States parties to Amended Protocol II and only 75 to the main Convention. More must be done to encourage accessions, by convincing States that had not yet acceded of the fundamental importance of Amended Protocol II in worldwide action to combat devices with devastating effects which were borne particularly by civilians and by increasing awareness that, although the Protocol and the Ottawa Convention differed in scope, they were complementary aspects of international law applicable to armed conflicts.

62. Sweden, as a party to the Ottawa Convention, had begun the destruction of its stockpiles, which was expected to be completed in the year 2001.

63. Mr. NENE (South Africa) said that South Africa's accession to the CCW and its recent expression of consent to be bound by Amended Protocol II and Protocol IV on Blinding Laser Weapons emphasized its commitment to alleviating the suffering caused by war and armed conflict and its awareness of its own responsibility to implement humanitarian and arms control policies to that end. At the domestic level, the authorities were in the process of finalizing enabling legislation for the provisions of Amended Protocol II. The South African National Defence Force was actively engaged in translating South Africa's obligations under the
Convention into appropriate instructions for its members. At the regional level South Africa was endeavoursing to help eradicate landmines, within the constraints of available resources, through direct contributions and the sharing of mine action expertise.

64. In Africa as elsewhere in the world mined areas and the mere suspicion of such areas caused untold fear and suffering while impeding the socio-economic growth of many communities. The participants in the Conference had a special responsibility to ensure that the international community continued to focus on the plight of mine victims and on their economic and social reintegration into society. However, the lack of universal commitment to the CCW and its Protocols did not reflect that responsibility as a priority: 16 years after its entry into force there were only slightly more than 70 States parties to the Convention, while only 44 States had declared their consent to be bound by Amended Protocol II. That problem should be addressed by the 2001 Review Conference.

65. The First Review Conference of the Parties to the CCW had led to significant achievements, but it had not achieved a ban on the use of anti-personnel mines, as many members of the international community had hoped. That disappointment had led to the realization by many States that the only immediate solution to the problem of landmines was an instrument for a comprehensive prohibition of anti-personnel mines outside of, but complementary to, the CCW. That realization had been the catalyst for the Ottawa Convention, which had had an enormous and immediate success. Its success had resulted in States becoming parties to the Ottawa Convention rather than the CCW. It was important to correct that situation by drawing the international community’s attention to the complementarity of the two treaties which codified rules on the use of weapons, one by totally prohibiting a specific weapon and the other by regulating the use of an entire category of weapons. Both treaties were based on two principles of international humanitarian law: the prohibition of the employment of weapons, projectiles and materials and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury in armed conflicts, and the need for a distinction to be made between civilians and combatants. South Africa was convinced that the ultimate goal of the international community should be universal accession to both the Ottawa Convention and the CCW and its Protocols.

66. The 2001 Review Conference should be the occasion for an exhaustive study of the possibilities available to assist those who still had difficulty accepting a ban on the use of anti-personnel mines. That was especially important in the context of article 8 of Amended Protocol II, as some were considering the possibility of a ban on transfers of anti-personnel mines. However, the feasibility of further amendments to Amended Protocol II should be balanced against the need to ensure universal adherence to the Protocol.

67. To protect civilians against the effects of mines, it was important to remove emplaced mines in the shortest possible time, in a cost-effective manner and with the least number of casualties. South Africa remained convinced that its “tool box approach” to solving demining problems was an appropriate one, which made available a wide range of alternative solutions for demining experts to apply under widely varying conditions. Similarly, the global landmine problem would never be effectively solved without competent and experienced managers able to utilize available resources most effectively.
68. Mr. MATEJKA (Czech Republic), pointing out that the Czech Republic had endorsed the European Union statement, said he would focus on his country’s specific national policies in the field. As early as 1990, the former Czechoslovakia had discontinued its landmine production programme, and in October 1994 the Czech Government had imposed a three-year moratorium on landmine exports, which had been extended indefinitely before the expiry date. By the end of 1997, the country had destroyed all 45,000 mines which did not meet the criteria laid down in Amended Protocol II.

69. The Czech Republic had taken all appropriate steps to comply with its commitments under Amended Protocol II. In particular, it had enacted legislative measures to ensure national implementation in accordance with articles 13 and 14: the Convention and Amended Protocol II had been incorporated into national legislation, the text of the Protocol had been published officially and its relevant provisions had been integrated into military instructions and military school curricula. Additional particulars were to be found in the annual report of the Czech Republic, for which the authorities had used the very convenient reporting format proposed by Austria.

70. On 26 October 1999 the Czech Republic had deposited the instrument of ratification of the Ottawa Convention, and the Act implementing the Convention should enter into force in early 2000.

71. The Czech Republic would continue to support all forums, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, which strove to involve all mine-producing States in efforts to eliminate the lethal weapons which landmines were. It sincerely hoped that universal application of Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention would be achieved. Although it recognized the political and military problems cited by those who did not wish to accede for the time being, it sincerely hoped that those obstacles would be overcome in the foreseeable future. Implementation of Amended Protocol II was the first important stage for protecting the civilian population against excessive suffering and the indiscriminate effects of such weapons. With Protocol II in place it might be possible to consider a comprehensive landmine ban.

72. Mrs. KUNADI (India) said that the Annual Conference provided the very first opportunity after the entry into force of Amended Protocol II to take stock of the situation with regard to landmines and chart the future course leading to the next CCW Review Conference, to be held no later than 2001.

73. India had signed the Convention in 1981 and ratified it in 1984. It had signed Amended Protocol II in May 1996 and in 1999 it had ratified Amended Protocol II and Protocol IV and had deposited the instruments of ratification. Its position on the issue of landmines was clear and consistent: the objective of a non-discriminatory, universal and global ban on mines must be reached through a phased process that addressed the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders, while at the same time remedying the humanitarian crises that resulted from the irresponsible transfer and indiscriminate use of landmines. In view of defence needs, the elimination of landmines would be facilitated by the availability of appropriate non-lethal alternative technologies. In the humanitarian sphere, India attached importance to the
full and unhampered transfer of technology related to mine detection and clearance and to international assistance to enable countries to comply with the standards required by the Protocol.

74. India had taken a number of measures to fulfil its commitments under Amended Protocol II and to increase awareness of the Protocol. Various agencies and NGOs had participated in information and awareness campaigns throughout the country. In terms of technical requirements, India was taking steps to render its mine stocks fully compliant with the Protocol within the stipulated time period. Production of landmines incompatible with the Protocol had been discontinued and existing stocks would be rendered detectable. Self-destruction and self-deactivation devices were undergoing user trials.

75. India had also taken legislative, administrative and other measures concerning landmines. It had never exported landmines and had formally announced a moratorium, of an unlimited duration, on landmine exports.

76. India was not a mine-afflicted country. Indian forces used landmines with restraint and played an important role in the rehabilitation of landmine victims. India had successfully developed new prosthetic devices and had been extensively involved, in the last four decades, in United Nations-sponsored mine clearance and rehabilitation programmes throughout the world. India believed that the international community would need to redouble its efforts aimed at mine clearance and transfer of resources and technologies so that mines causing death and destruction were removed, according to the principle, “He who lays must recover”.

77. The guiding principle behind India’s commitment to strengthening the Protocol was its concern for the protection of civilian life and livelihood. It had agreed to extend the scope of the Protocol to cover armed conflicts not of an international character and continued to believe that there should be a complete prohibition of the use of landmines, booby traps and other devices in internal conflicts, especially concerning improvised explosive devices, which were often overlooked. A partial ban would be of limited utility. The use of anti-personnel landmines should be permitted only for the long-term defence of States’ borders. For its part, India had never used and would never use landmines in armed conflicts not of an international character.

78. India had in the past proposed a ban on all transfers of landmines, given that mines which destroyed civilian lives were not produced locally but were the legacy of indiscriminate transfers. India preferred an outright ban on transfers to attempts to restrict them. The transfer ban issue might be addressed in the Conference on Disarmament on the basis of a mandate that would reflect the interests of all delegations. A number of countries had adopted moratoriums on anti-personnel landmine transfers, but such unilateral measures should be strengthened through an international commitment to ban mine transfers definitively. India urged States to live up to their commitment not to transfer mines to non-State actors, as stipulated by article 8 of Amended Protocol II.

79. India looked forward to hearing ideas on how to ensure compliance with the CCW and its Protocol, but the Annual Conference should also exchange information on the implementation of the Protocol. Increased transparency and regular exchange of information would be useful in enhancing confidence. Verification mechanisms might actually deter wider adherence to the
Protocols. As low adherence continued to be a glaring deficiency of the CCW process, it might be necessary to wait for an evolution in the broader framework of transparency in armaments before establishing them.

80. Mr. HELD (Switzerland) said that his country welcomed the acceptance of Amended Protocol II by certain States which had not yet been able to accede to the Ottawa Convention. The Protocol provided less protection than the Convention, but its adoption by consensus was a welcome development. In addition, it covered not only anti-personnel landmines, but anti-tank mines and was applicable to internal as well as international conflicts. It established the obligation to make mines detectable and to equip some mines with a self-destruction or self-deactivation device. Lastly, it prohibited the transfer of mines which were not in conformity with its provisions. States parties were under an obligation to incorporate its provisions into their national legislation and to punish any violations.

81. Switzerland would like to see more States parties submit their annual reports. It regularly endeavoured to convince signatory States to ratify the Protocol and States which had neither signed nor ratified the Protocol to accede to both the CCW and the Protocol. It also supported the General Assembly’s call for all States parties to express to the Secretary-General of the United Nations their consent to be bound by Amended Protocol II.

82. The Annual Conferences and Review Conferences were especially important as no formal verification mechanism had been established. To protect civilians, it was essential for Amended Protocol II to be implemented and for a broad, transparent and constructive debate on the national reports to take place. In that connection Switzerland welcomed Austria’s proposed draft format for reports. Cooperation and technical assistance were essential to avoid technical difficulties delaying certain States’ ratification of the Protocol.

83. Switzerland would carefully study all proposals intended to strengthen the Protocol, but the primary objective should be to make the Protocol a minimum standard applicable to all States. Was it feasible to have four legal instruments on anti-personnel landmines? Might a further strengthening of the Protocol not have negative effects on the ratifications in progress? Switzerland was prepared to examine all specific problems and all proposals concerning the implementation of Amended Protocol II. The issue of cluster bombs had been raised, although it was not within the purview of the Protocol, it might be addressed by the 2001 Review Conference.

84. Since 1993, Switzerland had provided increasing support for mine clearance, at both the multilateral and bilateral levels, primarily through its army. It had made donations to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance, supported programmes in several countries and helped establish the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. It had recently pledged to allocate S20 million within the following four years to action to combat anti-personnel landmines and assist mine victims, and to projects relating to small arms.

85. Mr. ISCAN (Observer for Turkey) said that his country was fully aware of the suffering and casualties caused by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of mines, booby traps and other devices. It therefore welcomed the entry into force of Amended Protocol II and of the Ottawa Convention.
86. Turkey's need to protect its long borders and to combat terrorist organizations, which used such weapons indiscriminately and to combat drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking had so far prevented it from signing either instrument. However, in January 1996 it had put into effect a national moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, which would be extended for a further three years on its expiry.

87. Turkey had also signed and ratified in 1999 a bilateral agreement with Bulgaria on the non-use of anti-personnel landmines and their removal from an area 32 km deep on each side of their common border. It hoped to conclude similar agreements with its other neighbours. Its participation in the First Meeting of the States parties to the Ottawa Convention as an observer had constituted another important sign of the progressive nature of its mine policy. At the Meeting it had declared its intention to sign the Ottawa Convention.

88. Mr. HERBY (Observer for the International Committee of the Red Cross) said that the First Annual Conference provided an excellent opportunity to take stock of the achievements of the 1996 Review Conference and to begin, at least informally, to develop agreement on what remained to be done to ensure that the weapons regulated by Amended Protocol II ceased to strike indiscriminately at soldiers and civilians alike.

89. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) strongly urged States to accede to the Ottawa Convention, which it considered to be the only adequate response to the humanitarian crisis caused by anti-personnel landmines. However, it had since mid-1996 actively promoted adherence to Amended Protocol II, which was the sole instrument regulating anti-vehicle mines, booby traps and similar devices as well as anti-personnel landmines, and which constituted the minimum norm for the use of such weapons by States which had not yet been able to accede to the Ottawa Convention. ICRC had worked actively to promote awareness throughout the world of the provisions of the Protocol and to explain the accession and ratification processes. It had also sought to dispel the belief that accession to Amended Protocol II was incompatible with accession to the Ottawa Convention. It strongly urged States which had not yet done so to accede to the Protocol before the 2001 Review Conference and asked States which had opted to delay implementation of key provisions on detectability and self-destruction to implement them urgently.

90. He drew attention to the potential threats to civilian populations of the growing use of anti-vehicle mines with anti-handling devices or devices which triggered detonation through a person's passage over or contact with the mine. Many experts believed that such devices could be designed in such a manner as to limit the danger to innocent civilians, and ICRC welcomed the action of States which had prohibited such devices as being inconsistent with their obligations under the Ottawa Convention and with the general rules of international humanitarian law.

91. ICRC planned to host a meeting of governmental and other experts in 2000 to consider a comprehensive approach to the serious problem created by explosive remnants of war, in particular explosive devices left in place. It believed that such a solution, outside the context of Amended Protocol II, might be preferable to further amendments, which might create confusion among parties to various versions of the Protocol and deter additional States from acceding.
The CCW and the Ottawa Convention provided a potential framework for resolving the humanitarian problem raised by the weapons concerned, given the now universal recognition of that problem and the technical possibilities available.

Mr. KVOK (Observer for the Russian Federation) said that it was important to proceed gradually towards the ultimate goal of a world without anti-personnel landmines. The international community must neither mark time nor act too hastily, or concrete results would not be achieved. The Russian Federation, for its part, could not cease using anti-personnel mines completely as yet, for geostrategic reasons and for lack of alternative means.

Amended Protocol II could play a key role in the gradual establishment of a world without anti-personnel landmines, as it represented the most universal and the best format so far for combating the scourge of landmines. It struck a balance between humanitarian considerations and disarmament requirements relating to the banning and restricting of the use of landmines.

The current climate in the Russian Federation was conducive to the elimination of mines and other such devices. For several years the Russian Federation had been observing a moratorium on the export of certain types of particularly dangerous mines; the moratorium had been extended for five years in December 1997 by presidential decree. The Russian Federation had also ceased all production of blast mines, which caused the most mutilations among civilians. During the period 1998-1999, the Russian army and Russian industry had destroyed approximately 850,000 anti-personnel mines, over and above the numbers originally planned.

The Russian Federation participated in international mine clearance operations, both in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and in Europe: it had removed or destroyed over 14,000 explosive devices in Bosnia and Herzegovina alone, more than 22,500 in Kosovo, 23,000 in the conflict zone between Georgia and Abkhazia and more than 500,000 in Chechnya. It was ready to increase its participation in mine clearance, and was also prepared to cooperate in developing innovative mine clearance methods and techniques.

The ratification procedure for Amended Protocol II was under way and should be completed shortly, after the opening of the State Duma session on 15 January 2000.

He noted with appreciation that the constructive attitude of a large number of countries that wished to proceed gradually and in a spirit of cooperation towards the total elimination of anti-personnel mines had so far made it possible to avoid a division of the international community into two opposing camps, the signatories of the Ottawa Convention on the one hand and those States which currently found it impossible to ratify the Ottawa Convention on the other.

His country was in favour of the establishment within the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc committee to elaborate an agreement on an anti-personnel landmine transfer ban. That having been said, better use should be made of the possibilities offered by Amended Protocol II to achieve the progressive elimination of landmines throughout the world.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.
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The meeting was called to order at 3:25 p.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (agenda item 11) (continued)

1. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil) said that his country had ratified the Amended Protocol II and Protocol IV to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) on 4 October 1999, thereby demonstrating its determination to support and participate in all international efforts in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. Brazil was a party to the entire spectrum of arms-related multilateral instruments and attached great importance to the disarmament and humanitarian goals pursued by the CCW in proscribing or restricting certain weapons which caused excessive injury and unnecessary suffering or had indiscriminate effects. International attention had justifiably focused on anti-personnel landmines, which not only killed or maimed but also seriously hampered the social and economic reconstruction and development of many countries.

2. Brazil had participated in the negotiations leading to the amendment of Protocol II. The new obligations agreed in 1996 were undoubtedly a step forward. His Government welcomed the fact that States parties had been able to agree on prohibiting non-detectable anti-personnel landmines and limiting allowed types of remotely delivered mines. All States which had not yet done so should accede to the Amended Protocol II as soon as possible.

3. Several Governments, including his own, and significant sections of civil society had feared that the Amended Protocol II would not satisfactorily address the problem of anti-personnel mines in a comprehensive manner. Brazil had therefore joined with other countries in the subsequent negotiations which had culminated in the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. States that were not yet parties to the Ottawa Convention should review their position and accede to it. In that connection, Brazil and most of its neighbours in Latin America were already parties to the Ottawa Convention, thus paving the way for the region to become a mine-free-zone. Their commitment to eradicating the scourge of anti-personnel mines was also complemented by a series of regional or subregional initiatives.

4. As long as the goal of universal and effective implementation of the Ottawa Convention remained unfulfilled, the Amended Protocol II would continue to play an important role, not least because it was not limited to anti-personnel landmines. Other kinds of existing and future devices that might have similar effects could be included in subsequent revisions of the instrument. Brazil was ready to consider proposals for strengthening provisions such as the one regarding the non-transfer of prohibited anti-personnel landmines to cover all types of such mines.

5. However, precious resources should not be wasted in an endless effort to revise the provisions on anti-personnel landmines. While certain provisions could indeed be broadened, it made little sense to engage in an indefinite process of amendment when the real aim should be the universal and effective implementation of the Ottawa Convention.
6. The need for annual conferences of States parties to the Amended Protocol II might also be reconsidered. The role of the Preparatory Committees and Review Conferences of the CCW should perhaps be strengthened. The Preparatory Committees could be devoted to more in-depth discussions on the inclusion of new types of weapons in additional protocols, as in the case of Protocol IV in 1995. The fact that it had proved possible to ban blinding laser weapons should encourage consideration of pre-emptively prohibiting other types of abhorrent weapons that were allegedly in the process of research and development. Brazil therefore intended to focus on strengthening the CCW as a whole.

7. Mr. KOLEV (Observer for The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Finland on behalf of the European Union. The Amended Protocol II strengthened the global regime for regulating landmines and was not contradictory to the Ottawa Convention. The two instruments were in fact complementary. Moreover, the Amended Protocol was a significant step forward in the development of both international disarmament law and humanitarian law.

8. Although The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was a party to the CCW and its three original Protocols, the recent events in the Balkans had prevented it from initiating the procedure for ratifying the Amended Protocol II until 3 November 1999. The Republic was, however, a party to the 1997 Ottawa Convention and it had halted the production and use of all types of mines even before becoming a party to that Convention and to the CCW. Stockpiled mines in its possession were under complete control and no transfers had taken place. It would not engage in laying mines or creating minefields, and was in the process of finalizing a comprehensive programme for the destruction of stockpiled mines.

9. International action to restrict or ban landmines had thus far been based on inclusiveness, partnership, dialogue and openness. Only cooperation following those principles would consolidate partnership between Governments, international organizations and the institutions of civil society. The United Nations was the primary forum for ongoing efforts in that sphere, and a principal resource for assisting countries in dealing with landmines and their effects. All States which had not yet done so should express their consent to be bound by the Amended Protocol II.

10. Mr. LAWSON (Canada) said that, as a result of the tireless work of organizations such as the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), public expectations of the CCW had rapidly exceeded the ability of Governments to deliver a negotiated consensus-based agreement. In Canada, as in many other countries, the call for a ban on anti-personnel mines had led to a policy review and to the conclusion that the only sustainable solution to the landmines crisis was a comprehensive ban on such weapons. In the wake of the 1995-1996 CCW negotiations and the subsequent Ottawa process, the international community now had two instruments of international law dealing with anti-personnel mines. Canada regarded the Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention as being two paths leading to the same destination, namely the total elimination of anti-personnel mines, and it had therefore accepted the Amended Protocol in January 1998, shortly after ratifying the Ottawa Convention.

11. Canada wished to propose two practical steps which other delegations might wish to consider in connection with the work plan leading to the 2001 CCW Review Conference. First,
regarding article 2 on definitions, it would be useful to develop a common understanding of what exactly States parties were seeking to eliminate. In that effort they should be guided by the belief that greater rather than less technical precision was desirable, and should look at the technical work undertaken in the development of the definitions in the Ottawa Convention, which had further elaborated upon technical work within the CCW context. Second, article 14 on compliance needed to be examined with a view to universalizing norms and obligations in respect of the elimination of anti-personnel mines. Again, the work undertaken in the development of the Ottawa Convention could provide guidance.

12. Beyond the issue of anti-personnel mines, the Amended Protocol was the only existing international instrument which contained restrictions on anti-vehicle mines. States parties should examine ways in which the Protocol could be developed to protect civilians further from such weapons. Specifically, Canada would support efforts to develop minimal detectability standards for anti-vehicle mines similar to those already applicable to anti-personnel mines. It also supported efforts to examine restrictions and/or total prohibitions on remotely delivered anti-vehicle mines which were not equipped with self-destruct and/or self-deactivation devices.

13. Although Canada was encouraged by the number of States which had already accepted the Protocol, it was important to ensure that all States were engaged on the issue, through either of the two instruments of anti-personnel mine control. While the Canadian Government sincerely hoped that all States would ultimately accept a legally binding ban on those horrific weapons, it realized that some States would only be willing, in the short term, to accept restrictions on their use. However, even such minimal restrictions were not being fully observed. The Russian military was reportedly making highly indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines in Chechnya. Some mines had even been deployed outside Chechnya on the territory of Georgia. Moreover, Russian forces appeared to have taken few if any steps to protect civilians from the effects of mines, for example by posting signs, sentries or fences around known mined areas. Canada was also concerned about recent allegations that representatives of the State-owned Pakistan Ordnance Factories had offered to sell anti-personnel mines to a private United Kingdom citizen in direct violation of their obligations under the Amended Protocol II. Under article 8 of the Protocol, the Pakistani Government could supply mines only to a State or State agency authorized to receive such transfers.

14. Partial restrictions such as those contained within the Amended Protocol II should be regarded as an important but temporary step on the path towards the total elimination of anti-personnel mines. It was also essential to bear in mind the significant value of unilateral steps in expediting common efforts to secure a mine-free world. Unilateral bans on the production of new mines and the international trade in mines, as well as the destruction of stockpiles of mines, would be most welcome developments.

15. Mr. SUL Kyung-hoon (Observer for the Republic of Korea) said that, as a number of speakers had pointed out, in some countries the use of landmines remained an essential element for deterring possible aggression. Notwithstanding that fact, every effort should be made to use such weapons responsibly and minimize any unnecessary suffering or casualties, especially among innocent civilians. The Amended Protocol II balanced humanitarian objectives and legitimate military needs.
16. The Republic of Korea could not fully subscribe to a total ban on anti-personnel landmines until there was a significant improvement in the security situation on the Korean peninsula, or until suitable alternatives to anti-personnel mines become available. Nevertheless, his Government had announced an indefinite extension of its moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines and had honoured that commitment. It was also making annual contributions to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance.

17. The Republic of Korea was proceeding with domestic measures to accede to the Amended Protocol II as soon as possible, and was preparing the national legislation necessary for its implementation. In addition, it had already taken steps to meet all the requirements concerning the use of mines as set out in the Protocol, including making dumb mines detectable.

18. Mr. JAKUBOWSKI (Observer for Poland) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Finland on behalf of the European Union, but wished to add that Poland intended to complete the process of ratifying the Protocol as rapidly as possible, probably in the course of 2000, and would then submit its annual report following the format approved by the Conference.

19. Poland believed that the Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention were complementary, and that they should be further complemented by the ban on the transfer of anti-personnel mines negotiated at the Conference on Disarmament. Such a triad of legally binding instruments should create a multilateral legal arsenal flexible and spacious enough to accommodate the political preoccupations and defence needs of all States.

20. Poland supported all efforts to eliminate the scourge of landmines. In that connection, it had imposed an indefinite moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines from Polish territory, as well as backing demining endeavours, and would spare no effort to meet its obligations under the Protocol.

21. Mr. MATHESON (United States of America) said that the Amended Protocol was flexible enough to attract the adherence of all States, including those which were currently unable to accept a total prohibition on anti-personnel mines. In addition, the Protocol provided a vital measure of protection for civilians. It covered a variety of weapons not addressed by the Ottawa Convention, including anti-vehicle mines, booby-traps and other devices, which might endanger civilian populations if improperly used. Finally, the Protocol dealt with important matters not raised by the Ottawa Convention, including the basic rules for the use of mines and other devices, the systems for recording and marking minefields, and the protection of peacekeeping forces and humanitarian missions from the danger of mines.

22. For all those reasons, it was to be hoped that as many States as possible would accede to the Amended Protocol, whether or not they were parties to the Ottawa Convention. All States had a strong interest in observing the most rigorous restrictions on all types of landmines. If widely implemented, the Protocol could result in a substantial decrease in civilian casualties. Admittedly, the Protocol was not perfect. A number of improvements were called for, and they should be debated in the run-up to the 2001 Review Conference.
23. The United States intended to suggest several areas where improvements could be made: for example, enhancement of the current technical specifications in the Protocol, particularly with respect to the reliability of self-destruct and self-deactivation features; the adoption of further restrictions on mines other than anti-personnel landmines, specifically providing that all landmines should be detectable and that all remotely-delivered mines should have self-destruct or self-neutralization features; and the adoption of a regular procedure for considering allegations of non-compliance with restrictions on use, including the possibility of inspections.

24. The Amended Protocol was only one part of an effective overall strategy for dealing with the landmine problem. The broader strategy should include a vigorous worldwide mine clearance effort; a programme to assist States to clear mines and meet the standards of the Protocol; further international cooperation and control regarding the production, transfer and stockpiling of mines; and the consideration of alternatives to anti-personnel mines that presented less risk to civilians. Improvements to provide for their further protection were essential in strengthening the viability and utility of the Protocol.

25. Ms. ABOULNAGA (Observer for Egypt) said that Egypt had signed the CCW in 1981 and, although it had not yet ratified the Convention, it was committed to its principles. The Convention provided an appropriate framework for examining the problem of mines in all its dimensions - social, economic, humanitarian and development-related. Egypt had implemented a number of measures in pursuance of the Amended Protocol II: minimum use was made of landmines to protect its long borders; those borders were marked with barbed wire and signs; and Egypt was actively engaged in research and development for the elimination of landmines.

26. There were 23 million mines on Egyptian soil - second only to the number to be found in Angola. That amounted to one mine for every three inhabitants, covering an area of 288,000 square kilometres. Most of them had been laid during the Second World War by the countries involved in the fighting at El Alamein, yet they continued to hamper economic and social development. It was impossible for Egypt to exploit fully the great mineral, agricultural and tourism potential of that area. In addition, the mines claimed victims daily, maiming, disabling or killing.

27. Between 1981 and 1991 the Egyptian armed forces had cleared 11 million live mines and would continue their efforts to remove all of them. Nevertheless, Egypt requested those countries that had laid mines to meet their obligations, as reaffirmed in the Declaration issued following the 1995-1996 CCW Review Conference, by providing technical and material assistance for finding and removing landmines. Egypt's own resources were insufficient for such a huge and dangerous undertaking. Traditional methods were ineffective for the quantities involved and the difficulty was compounded by the fact that the mines had shifted over the years and could be buried under as much as six metres of sand.

28. Lastly, she expressed Egypt's support for the key role of the United Nations in mine removal operations and for the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance.

29. Mr. REYELS (Germany) said that the Amended Protocol II set minimum humanitarian standards applicable to all kinds of landmines and Germany endorsed calls for all States to accede to it. The key instrument relating to anti-personnel mines, however, was the Ottawa
Convention, which was complementary to the Amended Protocol II. That Convention had broken new ground and Germany was committed to working for its worldwide acceptance and full implementation. Work on effective, rapid mine clearance must continue and intensify, and his Government had given substantial support to bilateral mine-clearance and victim-assistance projects in 23 different countries since 1993. In 1999 that assistance had focused particularly on Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia, Kosovo, Laos and Mozambique.

30. It was essential to improve international coordination of mine action, including the activities of regional organizations, and Germany supported the central coordinating role played by the United Nations through the Mine Action Service of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

31. The national authorities of affected countries had the decisive, if not the ultimate, responsibility for mine action and Germany attached special importance to the establishment of competent national structures and operational demining capabilities. Its assistance in mine action focused on countries that had signed and ratified the Ottawa Convention and that adhered to its principles.

32. A number of weapons not covered by the Ottawa Convention were covered by the Amended Protocol II, notably anti-vehicle mines, although there was still considerable room for improvement in the Protocol’s humanitarian provisions relating to such mines. The Conference should also take the opportunity to explore ideas on how to minimize the dangers of long-lived or undetectable mines, while at the same time working for the universality of the Protocol.

33. Mr. IENG (Cambodia) said that Cambodia’s new-found freedom from internal armed conflict and political instability gave grounds for hope in what was one of the world’s most mine-affected countries. Cambodia had embarked upon a huge programme of reforms and its admission to the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) offered it the opportunity to mobilize all its resources in rebuilding and developing the nation.

34. Cambodia had ratified the Amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention, thereby instituting comprehensive legislative frameworks enabling the Government to rid the country of landmines. Recent legislation also banned and punished the production, use, possession, transfer, trade, sale, import and export of anti-personnel mines, as well as providing for the destruction of existing stockpiles and the establishment of a mine-control commission. A national demining regulatory authority was currently being set up to coordinate demining activities and monitor the services of mine-action operators in Cambodia.

35. Meanwhile, the Government was continuing with the demining operations started under the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) through the Cambodian Mine Action Centre (CMAC). The casualty rate had dropped considerably and he believed that Cambodia was in a position to reduce it to zero in the near future by identifying, marking and fencing off minefields and boosting mine-awareness activities. He expressed his gratitude to the donor community for its support, which was of major importance in mine action.
36. **Mr. SGARBI** (Uruguay) said that his country did not produce mines and was active in a number of demining operations, particularly in territories of the former Soviet Union, in Central America and in Africa. Uruguay was now also completing the process of ratifying the Ottawa Convention:

37. His country fully supported the effective implementation of the Amended Protocol II, since it provided for measures relating to information on minefield location and specific protection measures, that would contribute to greater security, particularly in post-conflict situations.

38. In parallel with the marking and registration procedures, work should continue towards the progressive elimination of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines, and he recalled the commitment by the members of the Southern Cone common market (Mercosur), together with Bolivia and Chile, to efforts to make the region - and the entire western hemisphere - a mine-free zone.

39. **Mr. GOOSE** (Observer for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines - ICBL) said that the Conference was another opportunity to move closer to the rapidly emerging international norm against any possession or use of anti-personnel landmines. It had often been argued that the Amended Protocol II was more all-embracing of the international community than the Ottawa Convention, yet the facts proved otherwise. The Ottawa Convention had twice as many States parties as the Amended Protocol II, and had been signed by all but 5 of the 44 States parties to the Protocol, which had woefully little participation by developing nations, especially those where anti-personnel mines had been used most. In reality, the Amended Protocol II was an extremely limited instrument, and one for those nations that continued to resist the new standard of behaviour and to place questionable military considerations above indisputable humanitarian realities. ICBL thus again called on all States to become parties to the Ottawa Convention, which provided the only real answer to the humanitarian crisis posed by anti-personnel mines.

40. ICBL at the same time urged Governments to see the Amended Protocol II not as being in competition with or as an alternative to the Ottawa Convention but as a means of moving towards a universal ban. Any changes envisaged in the Protocol should be aimed at bringing it closer to the Convention, which had much stronger definitions, scope and compliance provisions. ICBL also agreed with the representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross that anti-vehicle mines with anti-handling devices that acted like anti-personnel mines were anti-personnel mines and should be subject to restrictions under both the Protocol and the Convention.

41. He recalled that Angola, a signatory to the Ottawa Convention, which also had its weaknesses, had been strongly criticized recently for continuing to use mines. If the Amended Protocol II was to be effective, Governments needed to investigate possible transgressions and take meaningful steps to curb them. Events since May 1996 revealed the inadequacy of the "restrictions-only" approach to solving the global landmines crisis and the unwillingness of some of those who supported it to live with its weak provisions. For example, Russia was deploying anti-personnel landmines, which were prohibited under the Protocol, in Chechnya. An official of the Pakistan High Commission in London had been filmed offering anti-personnel landmines for
sale, in violation of the Protocol, as well as of Pakistan's own domestic law and of United Kingdom law. Pakistan had also used landmines in its border conflict with India earlier in the year, apparently without marking or fencing them off as required under the Protocol. The United States of America had reserved the right to use anti-personnel landmines in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) campaign in Yugoslavia and Kosovo, even though 17 of the other 18 NATO members had prohibited their use. Israel, a party to the original Protocol, had continued to use anti-personnel landmines in southern Lebanon. Furthermore, the five States parties to the Amended Protocol II that had not signed the Ottawa Convention were estimated to possess over 125 million anti-personnel landmines and the nine States parties to the original Protocol might have another 100 million.

42. It should be painfully clear that the only meaningful way to tackle the humanitarian scourge of anti-personnel landmines was through an unambiguous ban. ICBL called on all Governments that had not yet done so to adhere to the Ottawa Convention; failing or pending that, it asked the participants in the Conference to move the Amended Protocol II as quickly as possible towards a comprehensive ban.

43. ICBL had been disturbed by the frequent references to the "complementarity" of the Protocol and the Convention. It had to be emphasized that anti-personnel landmines were illegal under customary international humanitarian law, and there should be outrage at any use and no benign acceptance that it was in order for some Governments to continue to use them.

44. The Nobel Committee, in awarding the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize to ICBL and Jodie Williams, had recognized not only the organization's work to make the mine ban a reality, but also the new model of diplomacy forged in the Ottawa process, where there was an open partnership between civil society and Governments in addressing a global crisis of concern to all. Unfortunately, in the present forum, some Governments appeared to wish to conduct the business of the people behind closed doors, according to the old model. He invited all delegations to discuss with ICBL how they could move forward to embrace the global norm to eliminate anti-personnel landmines.

45. Mr. ELLAHJ (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the allegations that the Pakistan Ordnance Factories were trying to export anti-personnel landmines and regretted that the speakers repeating those allegations had not first sought clarification from his delegation. To put the record straight, he cited a press release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 8 December 1999, which reaffirmed that the policy of the Government of Pakistan was to maintain a complete prohibition on exports of anti-personnel landmines. The weapons exported from Pakistan were exclusively for defensive purposes, and in no way violated the provisions of the Amended Protocol II.

46. With regard to the "sting" operation involving an official of the Pakistan High Commission in London, the matter was being investigated. A sale of the kind alleged in the television report could not possibly have taken place, since all exports of defence equipment manufactured in Pakistan had to be cleared by both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defence. While the investigation was still at a preliminary stage, it was already clear
that no anti-personnel landmines had been offered for sale, although defender-operated devices might have been discussed during an exhibition of defence equipment. The story revealed that trials by media and innuendo were hardly likely to advance good causes.

47. The "border conflict" referred to by the spokesperson for ICBL had been going on for 52 years. While it was true that the line of control was consequently heavily mined, there was nothing new in the situation to suggest that Pakistan had violated any of its obligations under international law or the Amended Protocol II.

48. Mr. CLARK (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that when his Government had learned of the allegation against the official of the Pakistan High Commission in London from a television company, it had immediately referred the matter to the appropriate law enforcement authorities to determine whether the United Kingdom Landmines Act had been breached. It would be inappropriate to comment further while the incident was under investigation.

49. Mr. NETO (Observer for Angola), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reacted to the claim that Angola had been laying more mines contrary to its treaty obligations. In fact, Angola was one of the few African countries to have destroyed its stocks of landmines. The mine-clearance programme had been carried out with international help, including from the United Nations, and vast quantities of landmines had been destroyed in the presence of distinguished international witnesses, including heads of State. However, one of the parties to the Lusaka peace process, the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA), had begun to lay mines in cleared areas and restarted a brutal war, while the international community could only look on helplessly. In those circumstances, mines might therefore have been laid in self-defence, but certainly not in order to harm Angolan civilians. The Angolan Government took its international responsibilities very seriously and had shown good faith in its efforts to dispose of mines. Non-governmental organizations should not distort the true picture in their reports and statements in international forums. Angola had the greatest respect for the decisions of the United Nations and the wishes of civil society, but it needed support and encouragement if it was finally to clear all mines from its territory.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE PROTOCOL (agenda item 12)

50. The PRESIDENT, recalling that article 13, paragraph 3, of the Amended Protocol II required the Conference to review the operation and status of the Protocol, drew attention to a working paper (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.6) which he had prepared for discussion in that connection. It would be noted that only 44 States had notified the Depositary of their consent to be bound by the Protocol, and also that only 28 of those States had submitted national annual reports under article 13, paragraph 4. Since 44 was a relatively low number of adherents for such an important international instrument, the Conference would need to consider how to promote the acceleration and broadening of the ratification process. One way might be for it to issue a collective appeal to States that had not yet done so to take all measures to accede to the Protocol as soon as possible. Such an appeal, similar to the one contained in United Nations General Assembly resolution 54/58, could be included in the report of the First Annual Conference.
PREPARATION FOR REVIEW CONFERENCES (agenda item 14)

51. The PRESIDENT pointed out that General Assembly resolution 54/58 also referred both to the convening of the Second Annual Conference of the States parties to the Amended Protocol II and to the convening of the Second Review Conference of the CCW. After consultations, an extended Bureau meeting had concurred with the suggestion that the Second Annual Conference should be held for a period of three days as from 11 December 2000. A provisional agenda was available for discussion in document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.4. The Bureau had also agreed with the suggestion to recommend that an extra day should be set aside for a preparatory meeting, immediately after the Second Annual Conference, with a view to the holding of the CCW Review Conference in 2001.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.
Geneva, 15-17 December 1999
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The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

REPORT(S) OF ANY SUBSIDIARY ORGAN(S) (agenda item 16) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.2)

1. **Mr. DAHINDEN** (Switzerland), introducing the draft report (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.2) of the group of experts established by the Conference at its first plenary meeting, in accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, to consider agenda items 13 and 15, said that the group, which he had chaired, had held two meetings. In discharging its functions, the group had considered matters arising from reports by States parties under article 13, paragraph 4, of the Protocol and the development of technologies to protect civilians against indiscriminate effects of mines.

2. The group of experts had had before it 31 national annual reports, as listed in appendix B of the draft report. In order to enable States parties to consider the annual reports, the group recommended that reports should be submitted eight weeks before the convening of annual conferences (recommendation A in the draft report).

3. The group had also analysed the substance of the national reports and the various points raised were summarized in appendix A of the draft report. In that regard, he indicated that reporting of rehabilitation programmes should include land reclamation as well as victim assistance. In order to make full use of the reporting mechanism, the group recommended that, if applicable, national annual reports should also emphasize requirements for assistance in mine clearance and rehabilitation (recommendation B), with a view to possible bilateral or multilateral cooperation.

4. With regard to the question of a standardized format for the reports, the group had based its discussions on a model proposed by the delegation of Austria and used by the majority of States parties. The group had agreed that such a format would make it easier not only to prepare the reports, but also to evaluate them and compare the information they contained. The group had amended the Austrian proposal and submitted an amended format for the approval of the Conference (recommendation C and appendix C of the draft report), on the understanding that States parties would be under no legal obligation to use it and would be free to include additional information. While supporting the idea of a standardized format, the group clearly emphasized the developmental nature of such a format (recommendation D). The language in which reports were submitted could be a crucial element in their timely dissemination and evaluation, and the group considered that States parties should make efforts to provide an unofficial translation of their reports in one of the other working languages of the Conference (recommendation E).

5. The group also considered that the information contained in the national reports could be useful to others active in the field. However, to avoid compromising the quality of the reporting and in order to take account of States parties' security concerns, States parties should indicate whether or not they wished to make their national annual reports available to other parties, on the understanding that any costs arising out of consultation of the reports would be borne by the enquirers (recommendation F). The group had also considered to what extent access to the content of the reports could be improved by the establishment of a database. On consultation with the Depositary, it had become clear that the United Nations Secretary-General would need
to be given a mandate to that effect, which could have financial implications. That possibility should be taken into account by the Depositary and studied at the appropriate level (recommendation G).

6. In its consideration of the development of technologies, the group had discussed developments since 1996, when the Amended Protocol II had been adopted, and ongoing activities. Delegations should hold structured discussions on the subject (recommendation H) and the results might be compiled in a report that would assist States parties in furthering the cooperation and assistance objectives of the Amended Protocol II.

7. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the report of the group of experts.

8. It was so decided.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (agenda item 11) (continued)

9. Mr. ELLAHI (Pakistan) said that the first Annual Conference of States Parties to the Amended Protocol II represented a new milestone in the international community's endeavours to deal effectively with the global problem of landmines. The new Protocol marked a significant advance over existing proscriptions and restrictions and had set in motion a dynamic process of annual reviews and the exploration of avenues of cooperation as envisaged in article 13. That process made it possible to bring together not only those States that had been able to shoulder the obligations entailed by a comprehensive ban on anti-personnel mines but also those that were attempting to reconcile military and defence requirements with fundamental humanitarian considerations. Annual conferences thus provided an invaluable opportunity to share experiences and collectively advance humanitarian goals.

10. Pakistan's particular defence requirements did not permit it to place a total ban on landmines, but shared humanitarian considerations and standards were duly taken into account. Its armed forces' awareness of the basic rules of humanitarian law, together with their discipline and training, had made it possible for Pakistan to embrace the CCW and its Protocols without ado. The region had witnessed the suffering of innocent victims of the vast numbers of mines in Afghanistan, and hundreds of thousands of refugees from there had moved into Pakistan. The situation in Afghanistan was a reminder that, in order to deal effectively with the problem of mines, it was not just legal instruments that were required but also concerted, innovative action on demining and victim rehabilitation by the international community. Pakistan's accession to the Amended Protocol II had been motivated by those twin objectives; there was no cause to doubt the sincerity of its intentions given the realities of the security situation, the history of regional conflicts and the resources required to implement the new Protocol.

11. It was not easy for a developing country to meet its obligations under the new instrument, and that was perhaps more difficult than for States able to accept a total ban. Pakistan had had to convert its entire stock of mines into detectable mines; eliminate an entire programme of self-neutralizing mines, which were now prohibited under the Amended Protocol; and send out revised orders to national users and producers on the basis of the new provisions. Pakistan's
national report to the Conference indicated what steps it had taken in accordance with the relevant articles of the Protocol and the arrangements it had made to inform its armed forces and producers of the country's responsibilities.

12. He reaffirmed Pakistan's full commitment to the unilateral moratorium on exports declared in 1991. His delegation had used the occasion of the First Annual Conference to brief other delegations and concerned organizations on a recent incident that had given the impression that Pakistan intended to export mines. Under existing procedures it was not possible to effect any international transfer without the express authority of the Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs. A moratorium on production had also been imposed during the negotiations on the new Protocol so that production goals could be harmonized with any new provisions emerging from the negotiations. Since then, production had been limited and had responded only to the real needs of the armed forces.

13. Pakistan believed that the annual conferences of the States parties to the Protocol should not only provide countries with an opportunity to express their positions on high ideals, but should also be used to bring about substantial advances towards the objectives and priorities identified in article 13, especially with regard to mine clearance and technical cooperation and assistance, and to initiate cooperation in developing viable technologies that could eventually replace landmines and thus further the cause of their complete elimination. His delegation welcomed the fact that the group of experts had endorsed Pakistan's proposals for the serious and structured consideration of those issues. Pakistani experts and demining teams had participated in mine-clearance operations in many parts of the world and Pakistan had also provided training in that regard. His Government would continue to make in-kind contributions to global demining efforts.

14. As the next Review Conference approached, the States parties should devise a set of priorities for the future. Efforts should be made to secure the widest possible adherence to the Amended Protocol II, to establish a global demining programme with adequate resources and based on new technologies, and to explore in the Conference on Disarmament further measures that would advance the goal of an ultimate global prohibition of landmines. Pakistan had been the first country to propose the appointment of a special coordinator for that purpose and continued to support the idea of negotiations, within the Conference on Disarmament, on a universal instrument banning transfers.

15. Mr. MARTYNOV (Observer for Belarus) said that the entry into force of the Amended Protocol II on 3 May 1996 had enabled the idea of a ban on the use of the most dangerous types of mines, and first and foremost anti-personnel mines, to take shape in a relatively short period of time. Belarus attached particular importance to the aims of the Amended Protocol II, as landmines had inflicted terrible suffering on its own population during both world wars and, 50 years later, thousands of mines and other ammunition buried in the ground still threatened the civilian population.

16. Belarusian participation in international action on anti-personnel mines was reflected in the presidential decree of 1995 establishing a moratorium on mine exports and in the fact that the country did not produce or intend to produce mines of any kind and did not use mines to protect
its borders or for any other purpose. In addition, Parliament’s ratification of the Amended Protocol II and other measures taken at national level showed that, despite its considerable arsenal, Belarus was in no way contributing to the mines crisis.

17. According to national assessments of the cost of implementing the provisions of the Amended Protocol II, Belarus would need millions of dollars for the destruction of its stocks of anti-personnel mines and for mine clearance in its territories. With its current budget commitments, Belarus would find it impossible to bear that burden alone and it called on the States parties to the Convention and concerned international organizations to provide in-kind assistance to Belarus in that area.

18. Belarus welcomed the fact that a mechanism for international cooperation and financial and technical assistance in mine clearance and the destruction of stocks of anti-personnel mines had been incorporated into the Amended Protocol II. The effectiveness of the implementation of those provisions was something Belarus would bear in mind when deciding whether or not to become a party to other related instruments such as the Ottawa Convention: although it was in full agreement with the aims of that Convention, his country could not accede to it until it had the required financial resources for the destruction of its stocks of millions of anti-personnel mines. It was therefore essential for Belarus to secure such assistance if it was to contribute to the banning and complete elimination of anti-personnel mines throughout the world.

19. Mr. MAIMESKOU (Observer for Ukraine) said that the importance of the first annual review of the implementation of the provisions of the Amended Protocol II could not be overestimated, despite the significant events that had taken place since its adoption in May 1996. Although it did not provide a radical solution to the problem of anti-personnel mines, the Amended Protocol II was becoming more and more meaningful as major States - historically, the users, producers and stockpilers of landmines - acceded to it. The annual review served as a unique bridge between States committed to a total ban on anti-personnel landmines and others which did not yet share that goal. Those links were even more important as long as the Conference on Disarmament was unable to achieve progress on the issue of eliminating mines.

20. The Parliament of Ukraine had just enacted legislation to ratify the Amended Protocol II, which should enter into force for Ukraine early in 2000. Work had begun on the preparation of standards and regulations based on the provisions of the Protocol; relevant instructions had been given to senior officials in the armed forces and information on the Protocol had been disseminated in the media. A decree regulating the deactivation of explosive munitions and mine-clearance activities was being drafted and a programme to eliminate stockpiles of anti-personnel mines had been prepared: the first stage would eliminate "butterfly" and blast mines, which were banned under the Amended Protocol II. A State demining and explosive-deactivation enterprise had also been established in Ukraine to promote peaceful uses of explosives; it had gained considerable experience in demining in a number of other countries.

21. As an active participant in the Ottawa process, Ukraine was pursuing a policy of banning and eliminating anti-personnel landmines, under which it had destroyed some 100,000 butterfly mines. In February 1999, Ukraine had signed the Ottawa Convention and prolonged the national moratorium on the export of all types of anti-personnel landmines, introduced in September 1995, by four years.
22. In that context, he wished to highlight the importance of the bilateral cooperation between Ukraine and Canada, begun in 1998 with the aim of eliminating stocks of anti-personnel landmines, which had involved contacts between experts and facilitated the adoption of cost-effective and ecologically safe methods of destruction. However, given its current financial hardships, the Government of Ukraine was also seeking to establish mutually beneficial cooperation with other countries for the same purpose.

23. Mr. AL-SAIDI (Observer for Yemen) welcomed the fact that the first Annual Conference of States parties to the Amended Protocol II was making the hoped-for progress and contributing to international action against mines, which not only killed and maimed innocent civilians but also hampered the development of the societies affected. The efforts being made by participating States indicated a desire to eliminate particularly harmful weapons as well as a genuine concern for peaceful relations. Yemen had not hesitated to become the first State in its region to sign the Ottawa Convention and its presence as an observer at the Conference was intended to demonstrate its support for the Amended Protocol II, which it regarded as complementary to the Ottawa Convention.

24. After having signed the Ottawa Convention, Yemen had drawn up an integrated programme to deal with mines with technical and financial assistance from the United States, Canada and other States. Yemen therefore now had a comprehensive programme that included not only demining operations but also awareness-raising, victim assistance and land rehabilitation. It had an exhaustive data bank on the socio-economic and health aspects of the mines problem and had carried out a full inventory of anti-personnel mines in Yemen. A comprehensive report on the matter had been sent to the United Nations Secretary-General.

25. Yemen was deeply grateful to such countries as Canada, Germany, Japan, Norway, Switzerland and the United States, which had been of great help in implementing its demining programme, and to the voluntary and non-governmental organizations that had also collaborated. He welcomed the decision to establish in Yemen the operational headquarters of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, to which it was prepared to give all necessary support. He hoped that donor countries would continue to support Yemen's anti-mine programme, the requirements of which were far beyond national capacity.

26. Mr. FERNANDEZ SALORIO (Argentina) said that the problem of the use of mines, booby traps and other devices mentioned in the Amended Protocol II was far from solved and his country was one of those making efforts to secure a total ban on anti-personnel mines.

27. Argentina believed that it was possible to make Latin America a mine-free zone. The Organization of American States (OAS) had declared in several resolutions that it wished to clear the western hemisphere of all anti-personnel landmines. The aim of the signatories of the 24 July 1998 Political Declaration of Mercosur, Bolivia and Chile as a Zone of Peace was to make progress towards the realization of a zone free from anti-personnel landmines in South America and to extend that zone to the entire western hemisphere.

28. His country was actively participating in demining activities being carried out as part of the United Nations peacekeeping operations and by OAS and was contributing to the assistance
provided under the "White Helmets" project. Argentina was not only a party to the Amended Protocol II but had also ratified the Ottawa Convention and was participating in initiatives on anti-personnel landmines in the context of the Conference on Disarmament.

29. There were anti-personnel mines on Argentine territory, in the Malvinas Islands. The situation had been brought to the attention of the United Nations Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions on assistance for demining, under which Member States were obliged to communicate all information necessary for United Nations activities in respect of mines and demining. Argentina had expressed its position on the question in a statement of interpretation made when it had deposited its instrument of ratification of the Ottawa Convention; a copy of the statement had been transmitted to the United Nations Secretary-General as Depositary of the CCW.

30. In 1993, the Argentine Government had in a spirit of good will and out of humanitarian considerations suggested to the British Government that it should take responsibility for removing the mines laid in the Malvinas Islands during the 1982 conflict as a result of that initiative, the two Governments were looking at ways of undertaking a feasibility study of the proposed demining operation.

31. Mr. KVOK (Observer for the Russian Federation) said he wished to reply to the questions asked by the delegation of Canada concerning the Russian armed forces' alleged arbitrary use of anti-personnel landmines. The delegation of Canada should base its statements on the facts and not on hearsay or information that bore little relation to reality.

32. The Russian Federation hoped to bring its anti-terrorist operation in Chechnya, an integral part of its territory, to a rapid end. The bandits and terrorists would be neutralized or physically eliminated.

33. The Russian armed forces had laid minefields to protect bases, depots and other important facilities, but had done so in strict conformity with the provisions of the Protocol and had prepared the requisite documentation in every case. Mines had been laid to block access to the mountainous regions where the terrorists obtained their supplies of arms, and had also been dropped by air, but all were equipped with a self-destruction mechanism.

34. The terrorists and bandits were themselves using all kinds of mines and booby traps - some of them prohibited under the Protocol - against the Russian armed forces, laying them on roads and in buildings and hydroelectric plants.

35. The Russian armed forces attached great importance to the removal of such mines and two demining units were working in Chechnya to enable the population to resume normal life as soon as possible.

36. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) said it was regrettable that only 44 countries had acceded to the Amended Protocol II; that was not nearly enough. His delegation supported the draft declaration
proposed by the President of the Annual Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.6) and wished to suggest a number of measures to promote universal accession to the Protocol.

37. In its final report, the Conference should underline the importance of universal ratification and invite States that had not yet ratified the Protocol to do so and States where ratification was in progress to speed up the process. The President could play a role in that respect in the interval between the first and second Annual Conferences and could also be requested to report to the General Assembly on the operation and status of the Protocol.

38. As Depositary of the instrument, the United Nations Secretary-General could also encourage States to accede and emphasize the importance of the Protocol for the protection of populations. States parties, in their turn, could carry out awareness-raising activities at the regional level.

39. It was important not to be too quick to make further amendments to Protocol II, if the accession process was not to be hampered.

Adoption of the draft declaration proposed by the President

40. After a discussion in which Mr. MATHESON (United States of America), Mr. KONGSTAD (Norway), Mr. LAWSON (Canada) and Mr. MUKUL (India) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that the Conference should adopt the draft declaration issued as document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.6, inserting the words "in this context" after "Noting "in the second preambular paragraph, and that the text of the declaration should be annexed to the final report.

41. It was so decided.

PREPARATION FOR REVIEW CONFERENCES (agenda item 14)
(CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.4, 5 and 9)

Second Annual Conference of the States parties to the Amended Protocol II

42. The PRESIDENT said his consultations had indicated that there would be no need for a preparatory meeting for the Second Annual Conference. The First Conference should therefore decide on the dates for the second Conference; adopt a provisional agenda and consider the cost estimates.

43. He suggested that the Second Conference should be held on the dates suggested by the secretariat, i.e. 11-13 December 2000.

44. It was so decided.
45. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the States parties to the Amended Protocol II approved the provisional agenda of the Second Annual Conference, as contained in document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.4.

46. It was so decided.

47. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the States parties to the Amended Protocol II approved the estimated costs for the second Annual Conference, as contained in document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.5.

48. It was so decided.

Second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons

49. The PRESIDENT recalled that the first CCW Review Conference had decided on 3 May 1996 that the second Review Conference would be held in 2001 at the latest. The extended bureau had considered that it would be wise for a preparatory committee for the Conference to meet on 14 December 2000, immediately following the Second Annual Conference of States Parties to the Amended Protocol II. In order to assist delegations in preparing for that meeting, the secretariat had drawn up cost estimates (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.9).

50. He took it that the First Annual Conference of States Parties to the Amended Protocol II decided to recommend to the States parties to the CCW that a meeting of the preparatory committee should be convened for 14 December 2000, on the understanding that the matter would be addressed in a resolution to be adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its fifty-fifth session in autumn 2000.

51. It was so decided.

52. The PRESIDENT asked whether any delegation wished to comment on matters concerning the second Review Conference, bearing in mind that all comments should be confined to the status and operation of the Amended Protocol II.

53. Mr. MATHESON (United States of America) said it would be a good idea to begin thinking about how the Amended Protocol II could be improved, so as to be able to present concrete proposals to that end to the 2001 Review Conference for consideration and approval. Improvements should be made in three areas.

54. In the first place, although the Amended Protocol II covered landmines other than anti-personnel mines, the provisions relating to the former did not guarantee the civilian population nearly as much comprehensive protection as the provisions that related solely to the latter. It sufficed to consider anti-vehicle mines, which, unless detected, claimed many victims from among civilians using the roads where they were laid and therefore not only denied access to specific areas by the civilian population and humanitarian missions but also posed a danger for peacekeeping forces. That gap needed to be filled, by extending to all landmines the provisions
on detectability with standard equipment that currently applied only to anti-personnel mines. It would also be in the interests of the civilian population to require that all types of remotely-delivered mines should be equipped with a self-destruction or self-neutralization mechanism and incorporate a self-deactivating device.

55. Secondly, with regard to anti-personnel mines, he recalled the specifications listed in paragraph 3 (a) of the Technical Annex of the Protocol and said that it should be perfectly possible to enhance the reliability of the self-destruction mechanisms or self-deactivating devices of such mines without cost to the States parties and without compromising their legitimate defence interests. That would further reduce the dangers of such devices for the civilian population.

56. Thirdly, it would be useful to supplement the Amended Protocol II with a procedure for considering allegations of non-implementation of the provisions of the Protocol regulating the use of mines, booby traps and other devices. The United States believed that such a procedure should provide for on-site inspections to be carried out as necessary, yet should be limited, non-intrusive and conceived in such a way as to avoid abuses and safeguard States' constitutional obligations and national security.

57. Any proposed amendments to the Protocol would naturally be submitted for approval to the 2001 Review Conference and prior consultations should be held to consider such proposals in their form and substance and to examine them from every angle - technical, military, financial and legal. However, consultations of that kind took time, and it was therefore important to begin immediately. With that in mind, he suggested that, in 2000 and before the second Annual Conference, the President of the Conference should hold informal, open-ended consultations in order to consider all proposals aimed at enhancing the Amended Protocol II.

58. Fears had been expressed that further amending the Amended Protocol II would discourage States from acceding to it. Similar misgivings had been voiced with regard to universal accession to the CCW at the start of the first process of amending Protocol II. Those fears had proved groundless, and more than 30 States had ratified the CCW during or after the negotiations on the Amended Protocol II. Indeed, the improvements made to the old Protocol had probably encouraged States to accede to the Convention and the annexed instruments. Further appropriate improvements would certainly provide fresh impetus to their universal ratification.

59. Mr. ELLAH (Pakistan) said that any new legal instrument demanded enormous efforts from States in preparing for implementation and then in implementation itself. That had not been easy in the case of the Amended Protocol II and it was therefore important to think very carefully before making any further amendments. The 2001 Review Conference would be a more appropriate setting for consultations. In the intervening period, the States parties could usefully consider issues surrounding the implementation of the present Protocol, in particular those relating to the cooperation measures under article 13, paragraph 4 (e), in the course of the structured debate it had been decided to hold during the second Annual Conference, in 2000.

60. Mr. WANG Xiaoyu (China) thanked the representative of the United States for the information he had provided concerning his country's intentions, but still believed that it was far
too soon to be thinking of making any improvements to the Amended Protocol II, even within a
two-year time-frame. It would first be necessary to establish to what extent each of the States
parties had fulfilled its obligations and to make sure that all the provisions of the Protocol had
been fully implemented; only then would it be possible to give an opinion on the effectiveness of
the instrument and then to consider possible further amendments.

61. Mr. LAWSON (Canada) said that he, too, thought it necessary to lay down minimum
standards under the Protocol on the detectability of anti-vehicle mines, both for humanitarian
reasons and in the interests of members of peacekeeping missions and forces, and he supported
the idea of holding open-ended consultations in order to canvass States' views on what could be
done in that regard. He also agreed with the representative of the United States that improving
the Protocol would make Governments continue to think about the issues involved and would
probably encourage rather than discourage their accession.

62. Mr ELIASEN (Denmark) said that he found the suggestions made by the representative
of the United States very interesting, although he well understood the reservations expressed by
the representatives of Pakistan and China. He would prefer any proposed amendments to the
Protocol to be examined in due course by an informal open-ended group of experts, on the
understanding that the work of such a group would be without prejudice to the decisions taken at
the Second CCW Review Conference.

63. Mr. SANDERS (Netherlands) said that his Government also believed it would be
appropriate to enhance the Amended Protocol II and would be prepared to take part in informal
consultations on the substance of any proposals to that effect. Such discussions could be
regarded as an initial study of the issues, which would help States to move on to the next stage as
soon as the Amended Protocol II was being fully implemented.

64. Mr. LUCK (Australia) said that the suggestions made by the representative of the
United States were extremely useful and he supported the idea of requesting the President of the
Conference to hold informal consultations to consider them at a later date from every angle.

65. Mr. DE AGUIAR PATRIOTA (Brazil) said that the suggestions, and in particular the
idea of incorporating a verification mechanism into the Protocol, deserved consideration. He
was afraid, however, that States parties might become embroiled in a never-ending process of
amendment of Protocol II and forget to strengthen the CCW regime as a whole; he therefore
considered that any consultations should also be an occasion for studying what possibilities there
might be for improving the Convention or preparing new protocols on the subject.

66. Mr. REYELS (Germany) supported the idea of a process of informal consultation with a
view to remedying the considerable deficiencies in the Amended Protocol II, particularly with
regard to the detectability of anti-vehicle mines.

67. Mr. KIMURA (Japan) said that his Government would make a careful study of the highly
pertinent suggestions made by the United States and would be prepared to participate in the work
of an informal group of experts, which could be formed the following year.
68. Mr. KOFFLER (Austria) said that his country would be prepared to take part in a consultation process such as the one suggested by the representative of the United States, as long as it formed part of the extension of the Ottawa process and contributed to the universal ratification of that Convention.

69. Mr. FERNANDEZ SOLORIO (Argentina) said that, as a matter of principle, his Government welcomed any initiative to strengthen the implementation and effectiveness of the Amended Protocol II or of any other instrument on similar matters, and would give due consideration to the interesting proposals made by the United States.

70. Mr. ELLAHI (Pakistan) said he did not see why the Ottawa process mentioned by the representative of Austria should be the framework for consultations on possible amendments to the Amended Protocol II. He would like delegations to explain more clearly their perception of the proposals put forward by the United States.

71. Mr. MUKUL (India) said that what was needed first of all was to establish a regular exchange of information on the implementation of the Amended Protocol II, in order to build confidence among the States parties. One of the recommendations of the group of experts put before and approved by the current Conference related to the holding of structured discussions on international technical information exchange, international cooperation on mine clearance, technical cooperation and assistance and the development of viable and cost-effective technologies that could eventually replace anti-personnel landmines. He hoped that the mandate given to any group or mechanism would refer to those issues. He believed that a verification regime should not be included in the Protocol until greater transparency had been achieved in the whole area of conventional weapons; otherwise States might be discouraged from acceding to the Protocol.

72. Mr. MATHESON (United States of America) said he appreciated the support shown by various delegations for his suggestions. He well understood the concerns expressed by those others who had recommended that new ideas should be studied very carefully and with due regard for States' legitimate concern for their defence interests. He believed that the proposed consultation process must not be subject to preconditions and should not prejudge final decisions. It would merely be an opportunity for frank and open discussion of each others' views on what might reasonably be done. It was now up to the President to decide, in the light of the opinions expressed, what action should be taken on the proposal to hold informal consultations to consider what improvements might be made to the Amended Protocol II.

73. The PRESIDENT suggested that the action to be taken on the proposal of the United States should be considered at an informal meeting of the extended bureau of the Conference.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.
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In the absence of Mr. Molander (Sweden), Mr. Draganov (Bulgaria), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE FINAL DOCUMENTS (agenda item 17)

1. The PRESIDENT noted that, in paragraph 18 of the Procedural Report of the Preparatory Meeting (CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/1), the Meeting recommended that the First Annual Conference should produce a procedural report on its deliberations. He drew attention to document CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.3, which contained a draft of that report. He proposed that the Conference should consider the draft report paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 12

2. Paragraphs 1 to 12 were adopted.

Paragraph 13

3. The PRESIDENT said that the words “duly taken note of” in the second line should be replaced by the word “adopted”.

4. Paragraph 13, as orally amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 14 and 15

5. Paragraphs 14 and 15 were adopted.

Paragraphs 16 to 18

6. The PRESIDENT drew attention to changes in the paragraph numbering. The first line of section IV (“Any recommendations that emerge from the report of the group of experts”) should be deleted and the square brackets removed from the following paragraph, which should become paragraph 16. A proposal for a new paragraph 17 was contained on a separate leaf of paper which also bore the symbol CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.3. Existing paragraph 16 would then become paragraph 18.

7. Paragraphs 16 to 18, as orally amended, were adopted.

Paragraph 19

8. The PRESIDENT said that existing paragraph 17 should become paragraph 19, and should be amended to read: “The Conference also decided to recommend that Ambassador Kálmán Petőcz of Slovakia be elected President of the Second Annual Conference.”

9. Paragraph 19, as orally amended, was adopted.
Paragraphs 20 and 21

10. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a proposal for a new paragraph 20, which was contained on the same leaf of paper, also bearing the symbol CCW/AP.II/CONF.1/CRP.3, as the proposal for new paragraph 17. Existing paragraph 18 would become paragraph 21.

11. Paragraphs 20 and 21, as orally amended, were adopted.

CLOSURE OF THE CONFERENCE

12. The PRESIDENT said that the successful work accomplished by the First Annual Conference had provided a sound basis for progress towards the goal of eliminating anti-personnel landmines and augured well for the holding of similar conferences in the new millennium. After thanking the delegations for the constructive debate which had taken place, he declared the First Annual Conference of the States Parties to the Amended Protocol II to the CCW closed.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.
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Programme Coordinator, Advisor, Department of  
Foreign Affairs

Ms Anouk Lamarre  
Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CAPE VERDE

Mr. António Pedro Alves Lopes  
Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva

CHINA

H.E. Mr. Sha Zukang  
Director-General, Department of Arms Control and  
Disarmament, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Head of Delegation

H.E. Mr. Hu Xiaodi  
Ambassador for Disarmament Affairs, Geneva  
Representative

Mr. Guan Youfei  
Ministry of Defense

Mr. Guo Shoumin  
Ministry of Defense

Mr. Liu Beizhong  
Ministry of Defense

Mr. Wang Xiaoyu  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Zhang Wei  
Deputy Division Director, Department of Arms  
Control and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of  
Foreign Affairs
CHINA (continued)

Mr. Xu Bensheng
Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense

Ms Lou Danzhu
Attaché, Department of Arms Control and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms You Jia
Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. Zdeněk Matějka
Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Head of Delegation

Mr. Miroslav Somol
Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva

Lieutenant Colonel Jan Hejč
Ministry of Defense

Mr. Jaroslav Zouzal
Unit for Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Ivan Pintér
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

DENMARK

Mr. Knud-Arne Eliasen
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Head of Delegation

Ms Kira B. Grønlykke
Head of Section, Ministry of Defense

FINLAND

Mr. Antti Sierla
Deputy Director General, Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Mr. Timo Kantola
Counsellor, Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Ms Marja-Leena Vuorenpää
Counsellor, Permanent Representation to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Col. Yrjö Kukko
Military Advisor, Ministry of Defence, Helsinki

Ms Jenni Rissanen
Assistant, Permanent Mission, Geneva
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>S.E.M. Hubert de la Fortelle</td>
<td>Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent auprès de la Conférence du Désarmement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mme Véronique Bujon-Barre</td>
<td>Sous-Directeur du désarmement chimique et biologique et de la maîtrise des armements classiques au ministère des Affaires étrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Paul Dahan</td>
<td>Représentant Permanent adjoint auprès de la Conférence du Désarmement, Genève</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Michel Lanternier</td>
<td>Conseiller Militaire auprès de la Conférence du Désarmement, Genève</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Thomas Wagner</td>
<td>Premier Secrétaire auprès de la Représentation Permanente auprès de la Conférence du Désarmement, Genève</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Brossard</td>
<td>Etat-Major des Armées, Ministère de la Défence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel Potiron</td>
<td>Etat-Major des Armées, Ministère de la Défence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Maurice Bleicher</td>
<td>Délégation aux Affaires Stratégiques, Ministère de la Défence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>H.E. Dr. Rüdiger Reyels</td>
<td>Ambassador, Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Government for Disarmament and Arms Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E. Dr. Günther Seibert</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Klaus Achenbach</td>
<td>Counsellor, Permanent Representation to the Conference on Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Andreas Berg</td>
<td>First Secretary, Foreign Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Gerhard Schepe</td>
<td>Military Adviser, Representation to the Conference on Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel Klaus-Dieter Bermes</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Wolfgang Hirsch</td>
<td>Mine Expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GREECE

Mr. Ioannis Korinthios
First Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Head of Delegation

Mr. Angelos Ypsilantis
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mrs. Vassiliki Gounari
Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Lt.Col. Dimitrios Zafiropoulos
Legal Adviser, Ministry of Defense

Lt.Col. Athanassios Koutroupelis
Adviser, Ministry of Defense

HOLY SEE

S.E. Mgr Giuseppe Bertello
Nonce Apostolique, Observateur permanent du Saint-Siège, Genève

Abbé Massimo De Gregori
Mission permanente, Genève

Abbé Peter Henry
Conseiller technique

HUNGARY

H.E. Mr. Ferenc Bösenbacher
Chargé d’affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Dr. László Deák
First Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Attila Nyikos
Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

INDIA

H.E. Ms Savitri Kunadi
Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Mr. J. S. Mukul
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. D. B. Venkatesh Varma
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Colonel N. B. Patel
Ministry of Defence
IRELAND

H.E. Mrs. Anne Anderson  Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Mr. Kevin Dowling  First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ITALY

S.E. M. Giuseppe Balboni Acqua  Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent à la
Conférence du Désarmement
Chef de délégation

M. Marcello Griccioli  Conseiller d'Ambassade

M. Angelo Persiani  Conseiller d'Ambassade

M. Giovanni Iannuzzi  Conseiller de Légation

Colonel Giuseppe Cornacchia  Conseiller

Lt. Col. Giuseppe Gionti  Conseiller

Lt. Col. Francesco Giannatiempo  Conseiller

JAPAN

H.E. Mr. Akira Hayashi  Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to
the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Mr. Hisao Yamaguchi  Minister, Deputy Head of the Delegation to the
Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Colonel Kazuhiko Kimura  First Secretary and Defense Attaché, Delegation to
the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Mr. Kunio Kodama  Official, Arms Control and Disarmament Division,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

LIECHTENSTEIN

H.E. Mr. Norbert Frick  Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva

Ms Katja Gey-Ritter  First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva
LITHUANIA

Mr. Audrius Navikas
Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva

LUXEMBOURG

S.E. Mme Michèle Pranchère-Tomassini
Ambassadeur, Représentante Permanente, Genève

M. Alain Weber
Premier Secrétaire, Mission Permanente, Genève

Mme Joëlle Schiertz
Attaché, Mission Permanente, Genève

NETHERLANDS

H.E. Mr. Chris C. Sanders
Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Mr. Thymen Kouwenaar
Counsellor, Permanent Representation to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva
Deputy Head of Delegation

Mrs. Henriette Houben-van Notten
First Secretary, Permanent Representation to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Mr. Alexander G. Verbeek
Security Policy Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NEW ZEALAND

H.E. Mr. Clive Pearson
Ambassador for Disarmament, Permanent Mission to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Mr. John Borrie
Deputy Head of Mission, Permanent Mission to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva

Ms Jennifer Haydon
Executive Assistant, Permanent Mission, Geneva

NORWAY

H.E. Mr. Bjørn Skogmo
Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Geneva
Head of Delegation

Mr. Steffen Kongstad
Minister and Deputy Permanent Representative, Geneva
NORWAY (continued)

Mr. Jørn E. Gjelstad Adviser, Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Svein Henriksen Adviser, Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Major Tor Helge Moen Norwegian Defence Command

PAKISTAN

H.E. Mr. Munir Akram Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Geneva
Head of Delegation
Mr. Malik Azhar Ellahi Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva
Brigadier Feroz Hassan Khan Military Adviser
Mr. Zaheer A. Janjua First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PERU

S.E. Sr. Jorge Voto-Bernales Embajador, Representante Permanente, Ginebra
Sr. Manuel Rodriguez-Cuadros Ministro, Representante Permanente, Ginebra
Col. César Antonio Mendiola-Ciurlizza Ministerio de Defensa
Sr. Gustavo Laurie-Escandon Primer Secretario, Representación Permanente, Ginebra

PHILIPPINES

Mr. Denis Yap Lepatan Chargé d'Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva
Mrs. Maria Teresa C. Lepatan Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PORTUGAL

Mr. Fernando Demme de Brito Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SLOVAKIA

Mr. H.E. Mr. Kálmán Petöcz Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative, Head of Delegation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
<td>Mr. Marcel Jesenský</td>
<td>Department of OSCE, Disarmament and Council of Europe, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
<td>Mr. Karol Mistrik</td>
<td>Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
<td>Major Mr. František Žak</td>
<td>Slovak Verification Centre, Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. George S. Nene</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva, Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Markram</td>
<td>Deputy Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>Mr. Barend Jacobus Lombard</td>
<td>Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Sra. Dña. Mercedes Rico</td>
<td>Delegada en la Conferencia de Desarme, Ginebra, Jefe de Delegación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Sr. D. José Antonio Sabadell</td>
<td>Ministerio Asuntos Exteriores, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Sr. D. José Valdivieso</td>
<td>Ministerio de Defensa, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Sr. D. José Labandeira Alvariño</td>
<td>Ministerio de Defensa, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. Johan Molander</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva, Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Mrs. Anneli Lindahl Kenny</td>
<td>Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Mr. Bosse Hedberg</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Department of International Law, Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Ms Susanne Karlsson</td>
<td>Desk Officer, Department for Global Security, Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel Olof Carelius</td>
<td>Ministry of Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NICARAGUA (continued)

Srta. Cecilia Sanchez Reyes  
Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

OMAN

Mr. Edrees Al-Khanjari  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

POLAND

H.E. Mr. Krzysztof Jakubowski  
Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva

Major General Ryszard Żuchowski  
Adviser, Commander of the Engineering Corps in the Army Command

Lt. Col. Adam Wilczyński  
Adviser, Military counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Major Zbigniew Wołas  
Adviser, Ministry of Defence

Mr. Grzegorz Poznański  
Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Marek Orlński  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

QATAR

M. Abdulla H. Jaber  
Chargé d’Affaires, Mission permanente, Genève

Mr. Fadil Eltahir  
Mission permanente, Genève

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. Kim Jong-Hoon  
Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva  
Head of Delegation

Mr. Park Tong-Hyong  
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Sul Kyung-Hoon  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Park II  
Assistant Director for Disarmament and Nuclear Affairs Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Lt. Col. Kang Man-Sup  
Deputy Director for Arms Control Division, Ministry of National Defense
SWITZERLAND

M. Charles-Edouard Held  
Vice-directeur de la Direction du droit international public, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères  
Chef de délégation

M. Erwin Dahinden  
Chef de la Division de la maîtrise des armements, du droit international des conflits armés et de la coopération en matière de vérification, Département fédéral de la défense, de la protection de la population et des sports

M. Jörg Köhler  
Chef de section, Département fédéral de la défense, de la protection de la population et des sports

Mr. Reto Dürler  
Adjoint diplomatique à la Direction du droit international public, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères

M. Lukas Schifferle  
Collaborateur Diplomatique à la Division politique III, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères

M. René Haug  
Conseiller militaire, Mission permanente, Genève

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. Michael Clark  
Security Policy Department, Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Ms Helen Gates  
Second Secretary, Permanent Mission to the Conference on Disarmament

Mr. Derek Walton  
Legal Adviser  
Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Graham Hannington  
Ministry of Defence

Ms Susan Ridge  
Ministry of Defence

Mr. Alan Bryden  
Ministry of Defence

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Michael J. Matheson  
Principal Deputy Legal Adviser  
Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State

Mr. Robert M. Sherman  
ANCP Advisory Board  
Department of State
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (continued)

Mr. Edward Cummings  
Legal Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Steven Solomon  
Adviser, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Colonel Paul Hughes  
Office of the Secretary of Defense  
Department of Defense

Commander David Thorsen  
J-5, Joint Staff, Department of Defense

Mr. David Kaye  
Attorney Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser,  
Department of State

Mr. Craig Schopmeyer  
Bureau of Political -Military Affairs,  
Department of State

Mr. Thomas S. Reeder  
National Ground Intelligence Center, Department of Defence

URUGUAY

S.E. Sr. Carlos Pérez del Castillo  
Embajador, Representante Permanante, Ginebra

Sr. Carlos Sgarbi  
Ministre Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Sra. Laura Dupuy  
Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

ANGOLA

Mr. Rolando F.D.J. Neto  
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BANGLADESH

Ms Ismat Jahan  
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BELARUS

H.E. Mr. S. Martynov  
First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Head of Delegation

Mr. S. Mikhnevich  
Deputy Permanent Representative, Geneva

Mr. V. Ponkratenko  
Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

B. OBSERVERS
BOLIVIA
Sr. Pedro Gumucio Dragron  Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

BURKINA FASO
S.E.M. Mamadou Serme  Ambassadeur, Secrétaire Général du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Chef de délégation
M. Mahama Savadogo  Chef de Service Europe-Amérique Océanie, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

CHILE
H.E. Mr. Javier Illanes  Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva
Mr. Alfredo Labbé  Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva
Mr. Luis Maurelia  Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

COTE D'IVOIRE
S.E.M. Claude Beke Dassys  Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Genève
Capitaine Clément Kouadio Boni  Chimiste, Secrétaire permanent de la Commission pour l'Interdiction des Armes chimiques (CIAC-CI)
M. Jérôme Klôh Weya  Premier conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

CROATIA
H.E. Ms Spomenka Cek  Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva
Mr. Vice Skračić  Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva
Lt. Col. Antun Čičak  Armed Forces General Staff, Ministry of Defense

CUBA
Sr. Carlos Amat Fores  Embajador Extraordinario y Plenipotenciario, Representante Permanente, Ginebra
Sra. Anayansi Rodriguez Camejo  Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>H.E. Mrs. Fayza Aboulnaga</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Mohamed Tawfik</td>
<td>Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Amr Hafez</td>
<td>Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. Priit Pallum</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Merike Kokajev</td>
<td>First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>H.E. Dr. N. Hassan Wirajuda</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Iwan Wiranataaatmadja</td>
<td>Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Dian Wirengjurit</td>
<td>First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Bantan Nugroho</td>
<td>Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigadier General Syahrial</td>
<td>Adviser, Research and Development Agency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Dr. Nafia Mahdy</td>
<td>Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ghalib Askar</td>
<td>Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. David Peleg</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Amnon Efrat</td>
<td>Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Meir Itzchaki</td>
<td>Regional Security and Arms Control Department, Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Sharon Afek</td>
<td>Legal Advisor, International Law Division, Military Advocate General Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KUWAIT

Mr. Adel H.H. Al-Jassam  Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MALTA

H.E. Mr. Michael Bartolo  Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva
                         Head of Delegation

Mr. Pierre Clive Agius  First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MEXICO

S.E. Sr. Antonio de Icaza  Representante Permanente ante la Conferencia de
                         Desarme, Ginebra
                         Jefe de Delegación

Sra. Socorro Rovirosa Priego  Ministro, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

MONGOLIA

H.E. Mr. Suh-Ochir Bold  Ambassador, Permanent Representative
                         Head of Delegation

Mr. Gozon Jargalsaikhan  First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MOROCCO

S.E.M. Nacer Benjelloun-Touimi  Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Genève

Mlle Loubna Al Atlassi  Deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MYANMAR

Mr. Tin Maung Aye  Deputy Permanent Representative,
                  Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Ye Htut  Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

NICARAGUA

S.E. Mauricio Díaz Davila  Embajador, Representante Permanente
                         Jefe de Delegación
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. Ioan Maxim</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Radu Horumba</td>
<td>First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Nineta Barbulescu</td>
<td>Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIAN FEDERATION</td>
<td>Mr. Boris Kvok</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Department of Security and Disarmament, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Head of Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Evgeny Pushkarev</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Delegation, Ministry of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Yury Belobrov</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Mikhail Zenkin</td>
<td>Adviser, Federal Border Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Vladimir Kurikov</td>
<td>Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Vladimir Bobkov</td>
<td>Adviser, Ministry of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Viacheslav Pakhomov</td>
<td>Adviser, Ministry of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Andrey Malov</td>
<td>Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA LEONE</td>
<td>Mr. Luigi Santosuosso</td>
<td>Adviser, Permanent Mission, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVENIA</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. Gregor Zore</td>
<td>Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
<td>H.E. Mr. H. M. G. S. Palihakkara</td>
<td>Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. S. S. Ganegama Arachchi</td>
<td>First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A. S. U. Mendis</td>
<td>Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

H.E. Mr. Goce Petreski  
Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva

Mrs. Biljana Stefanovska-Sekovska  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mr. Nenad Kolev  
Third Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

TUNISIA

M. Ghazi Jomaa  
Conseiller des Affaires Etrangères près la Mission, Genève

M. Kadhem Baccar  
Conseiller des Affaires Etrangères près la Mission, Genève

TURKEY

H.E. Murat Sungar  
Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Geneva  
Head of Delegation

Mr. Erdoğan Işcan  
Deputy Permanent Representative, Geneva  
Deputy Head of Delegation

Ms Damla Yeşim Say  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

UKRAINE

H.E. Dr. Mykola Maimeskoul  
Ambassador, Permanent Representative,  
Head of Delegation

Mr. Volodymyr Dzyub  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Ms Olena Syrota  
Expert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

VENEZUELA

Mr. Ricardo Salas  
Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

YEMEN

H.E. Dr. Moutahar Al-Saidi  
Minister of the State of Cabinet Affairs  
Head of Delegation

H.E. Dr. Mohamed Saeed Al-Attar  
Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva
YEMEN (continued)

Mr. Ahmed Hassan Bin Hassan  
Minister Plenipotentiary

Ms Rashida Al-Hamdani  
Cabinet Office

ZAMBIA

Mr. E.M. Katongo  
First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

C. ORGANISATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

UNICEF

Ms Tehnaz J. Dastoor  
Focal Point, Landmines

Ms Birgitte van Delft  
Programme Officer

Mr. Stuart Maslen  
Legal Consultant

D. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Mr. Peter Herby  
Coordinator, Mines-Arms Unit, Legal Division

Mr. Louis Maresca  
Legal Adviser, Mines-Arms Unit, Legal Division

Mr. Dominique Loye  
Technical Advisor, Legal Division

Ms Ragnhild Imerslund  
Advisor

GENEVA INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR HUMANITARIAN DEMINING

Mr. Olivier F. Desarzens  
Deputy Director

Ms. Ana Andrino  
Policy Adviser
E. NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LANDMINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steve Goose</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Jody Williams</td>
<td>ICBL Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Susan B. Walker</td>
<td>ICBL Government Relations Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elizabeth Bernstein</td>
<td>ICBL Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Dalma Foldes</td>
<td>ICBL Resource Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sayed Aqa</td>
<td>Survey Action Center and Chair ICBL Mine Action Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Atwood</td>
<td>Quaker United Nations Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sylvie Brigot</td>
<td>Handicap International, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Anne Capelle</td>
<td>Handicap International, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tim Carstairs</td>
<td>Mines Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Philippe Chabasse</td>
<td>Handicap International France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Belkacem Elomari</td>
<td>Observatory on Arms Transfers, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Markus Haake</td>
<td>German Initiative to Ban Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Hawk</td>
<td>Landmine Survivors Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Head</td>
<td>New Zealand Campaign against Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Balkrishna Kurvey</td>
<td>Indian Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Rebecca Larson</td>
<td>Lutheran World Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laura Lodenius</td>
<td>Peace Union, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elisabeth Reusse-Decrey</td>
<td>Swiss Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Christian Ruge</td>
<td>Norwegian People’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Vermeulen</td>
<td>Handicap International, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ms Mary Wareham  Human Rights Watch
Mr. Virgil Wiebe  Mennonite Central Committee
Mr. Yury Zahumionau  Belarus Campaign to Ban Landmines